arXiv:1405.5230v3 [q-fin.MF] 5 Aug 2015

A FUNCTIONAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR LIMIT ORDER BOOKS WITH STATE DEPENDENT PRICE DYNAMICS[†]

CHRISTIAN BAYER, ULRICH HORST, AND JINNIAO QIU

Abstract. We consider a stochastic model for the dynamics of the two-sided limit order book (LOB). Our model is flexible enough to allow for a dependence of the price dynamics on volumes. For the joint dynamics of best bid and ask prices and the standing buy and sell volume densities, we derive a functional limit theorem, which states that our LOB model converges in distribution to a fully coupled SDE-SPDE system when the order arrival rates tend to infinity and the impact of an individual order arrival on the book as well as the tick size tends to zero. The SDE describes the bid/ask price dynamics while the SPDE describes the volume dynamics.

Key words: limit order book, functional limit theorem, stochastic partial differential equation

AMS Subject Classification: 60B11, 90B22, 91B70

1. Introduction

In modern financial markets almost all transactions are settled through Limit Order Books (LOBs). An LOB is a record – maintained by an exchange or specialist – of unexecuted orders awaiting execution. Unexecuted (standing) orders are executed against incoming market orders according to a set of precedence rules. Orders standing at better prices have priority over orders submitted at less competitive price levels ("price priority") while orders with the same price-priority are executed on a first-in-first-out basis ("time-priority"). From a mathematical perspective, LOBs can thus be viewed as high-dimensional complex priority queuing systems.

In this paper, we present a probabilistic framework within which to analyze scaling ("high frequency") limits of LOBs. In particular, we show how to obtain SPDE limits for LOBs by suitably scaling order arrival rates as well as order and tick sizes. Accounting for the well-documented fact that standing volumes, especially volume imbalances between the buy and sell side, have an impact on price dynamics in limit order markets (see [2, 4, 15] and references therein) we allow for a dependence of the price dynamics on standing volumes.

1.1. **Literature review.** There is a substantial economic and econometric literature on LOBs [2, 4, 15, 10, 13, 25] that puts a lot of emphasis on the realistic modeling of the working of the LOB. At the same time, only few authors have analyzed LOB dynamics from a more probabilistic perspective. Kruk [21] studied a queuing theoretic LOB model with finitely many price levels. For the special case of two price levels, in his model the scaled number of standing buy and sell orders at the top of the book converges

[†]Financial support from the SFB 649 "Economic Risk" is gratefully acknowledged. We thank seminar and conference participants at various institutions for helpful comments and suggestions. The paper was finished while Horst was visiting the Center for Interdisciplinary Research at Bielefeld University. Grateful acknowledgment is made for hospitality. An earlier version of this paper was entitled *A Functional Limit Theorem for Limit Order Books.*

weakly to a semimartingale reflected two-dimensional Brownian motion in the first quadrant. Cont, Stoikov and Talreja [7] proposed an LOB model with finitely many submission price levels where the LOB dynamics follows an ergodic Markov process. Cont and DeLarrard [5] established a scaling limit for a Markovian limit order market in which the state of the book is represented by the best bid and ask prices along with the liquidity standing at these prices ("top of the book"). Under heavy traffic conditions their bid and ask queue lengths are given by a two-dimensional Brownian motion in the first quadrant with reflection to the interior at the boundaries, similar to the diffusion limit for two price levels in [21].

When scaling limits of financial price fluctuations [1, 9, 11, 12, 18] or joint price and volume fluctuations at selected price levels [5, 21] are studied, the limit can naturally be described by ordinary differential equations or finite-dimensional diffusion processes, depending on the choice of scaling. The mathematical analysis is more challenging when the dynamics of the full book is considered. To the best of our knowledge, Osterrieder [24] was the first to model LOBs as measure-valued diffusions. Horst and Paulsen [17] proved a limit theorem for LOBs with an unbounded number of submission price levels when the tick size tends to zero and order arrival rates tend to infinity. With their choice of scaling the joint dynamics of volumes and prices converges to a coupled system of two PDEs that describe the limiting volume dynamics and two ODEs that describe the limiting price dynamics. A related model with state-dependent prices in the approximating sequence but constant prices in the limit is analyzed in [14]. A weak law of large numbers for LOBs with full state dependence allowing order arrival intensities and placement/cancellation price levels to depend on prices and volumes, has recently been established by Horst and Kreher [16]. We consider a different scalene regime where the limiting dynamics can be described by a fully coupled SDE-SPDE system.

1.2. **Our contribution.** As in [17] our limit result requires two time scales: a fast time scale for cancellations and limit order placements outside the spread and a comparably slow time scale for market order arrivals and limit order placements in the spread. The different time scales account for the well-documented fact that placements and cancellations occur much more frequently than price changes.

We assume placement and cancellation volumes are noisy. The noisy placements and cancellations may come from noise traders; alternatively, one may assume that an incoming limit order has a fixed size plus noise while cancellations are be good for fixed proportions plus noise. In order to obtain an SPDE limit from an event-by-event dynamics while keeping the analysis as tractable as possible we make three simplifying assumptions: (i) the noise terms share a common factor ("factor model") that changes at the same rate as prices do; (ii) the impact of the common factor on placements and cancellation is the same across all price levels; (iii) the impact of the noise on volumes is linear. Relaxing the first assumption is possible but may result in a different scaling limit, depending on the rate of change of the factor process; the same applies to the second assumption; relaxing the third assumption requires different mathematical techniques. Of course, conditions (i)-(iii) are void in the absence of noise, a case which we obtain as a byproduct. Even this case is considerably more general than that in [17] where prices are independent of volumes and [14] where the limiting price is trivial.

Our main result states that when the rates of market order arrivals and spread placements scale by a factor n, the rates of limit order arrivals and cancellations scale by a factor n^2, the tick size scales by a factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, the sizes (proportions) of incoming orders (volumes canceled) scale by a factor $\frac{1}{n^2}$ and the noise term scales by a factor $\frac{1}{n}$, then volume processes converge to a coupled SDE-SPDE system as $n \to \infty$. The convergence concept we chose is weak convergence in the class of càdlàg stochastic processes with sample paths in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (\mathcal{E}')^2$ where $\mathcal{E}'$ denotes the set of the tempered distributions. The main challenge

is to prove convergence of the $(\mathcal{E}')^2$-valued volume processes. First, the volume process is not a Markov process, due to the nature of the noise. Second, the interaction of the various event dynamics is rather complex. In particular, limit order placements and cancellations follow a (spatial) Poisson dynamics on a Poisson time scale generated by market order arrivals. To prove tightness we decompose the volume processes into three components describing aggregate placements, cancellations and "noise contributions" at the various price levels, respectively. Due to the linearity of the noise it is possible to analyze aggregate "noise contributions" separately. We establish norm-bounds for each of these processes from which we then deduce that the volume process as a whole satisfies a standard tightness criteria. To characterize the limit we first prove joint convergence of prices and the "noise contributions". Subsequently, we identify the limits of aggregate placements and cancellations and use C-tightness of the price and noise processes to prove joint convergence of all the processes to the desired limit.

The key observation is that tightness of the volume processes is guaranteed under mild assumptions on the price process; it does not require any particular dependence of prices on volumes. In particular, it does *not* require the price process to be independent from volumes. The *characterization* of the limiting volume dynamics requires joint convergence of volumes and prices along a subsequence. This is guaranteed if the price process is C-tight, a condition which, too, does not require any particular assumptions on the interplay between prices and volumes. If the limiting price process is known upfront, either because the approximating price process is independent of volumes as in [17] or the limiting price process is state-independent as in [14], then the limiting volume process exists and the joint dynamics of prices and volumes is fully specified. The added difficulty under state dependence is the identification of the limiting price/volume process. To this end, we first characterize the limiting volume dynamics as a function of the - unknown yet existing - weak accumulation point of the price process. Based on this partial characterization result, we then fully characterize the joint evolution of prices and volumes.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define a sequence of limit order books in terms of our scaling parameters (tick size, order arrival rates and order sizes), state the main result and give an outline of the proof. Section 3 is devoted to the analysis of the volume dynamics. In Section 4 we characterize the joint limit of the price/volume process. General tightness results as well as some technical proofs are collected in the appendixes.

2. Model and main results

2.1. **The discrete model.** In the sequel all random variables are defined on a common probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We may write $X(t)$ or X_t for the value of a stochastic process X at time $t \geq 0$.

In this section we introduce a sequence of discrete order book models with state-dependent price dynamics. The set of price levels at which orders can be submitted in the n-th model is $\{x_j^n\}_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}$. The assumption that there is no smallest price is made for analytical convenience; it avoids the introduction of a reflection term for the bid-ask price process at zero. We put $x_j^n := j \cdot \Delta x^n$ for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ where Δx^n is the *tick size*, i.e. the minimum difference between two consecutive price levels.

2.1.1. *The initial state.* The initial state of the book is given by a pair (B_0^n, A_0^n) with $B_0^n \leq A_0^n$ of best bid and ask prices together with the buy and sell *logarithmic* limit order volumes at different price levels.[1]

[1]We model logarithmic volumes to avoid negative volumes. The term "logarithmic" will be dropped in what follows.

We identify (logarithmic) volumes at the bid (buy) and ask (sell) side of the book with the step functions:

$$v_b^n(x) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} v_b^{n,j} \mathbb{1}_{[x_j^n, x_{j+1}^n)}(x), \quad v_a^n(x) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} v_a^{n,j} \mathbb{1}_{[x_j^n, x_{j+1}^n)}(x) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Throughout, indices b and a indicate the bid and ask side of the book, respectively. The liquidity available for selling/buying $j \in \mathbb{N}$ ticks below/above the best bid/ask price is then given by, respectively:

$$\int_{B_0^n + j\Delta x^n}^{B_0^n + (j+1)\Delta x^n} \exp(v_b^n(x))dx = \Delta x^n \cdot \exp\left(v_b^{n, B_0^n/\Delta x^n + j}\right), \quad \int_{A_0^n + j\Delta x^n}^{A_0^n + (j+1)\Delta x^n} \exp(v_a^n(x))dx = \Delta x^n \cdot \exp\left(v_a^{n, A_0^n/\Delta x^n + j}\right).$$

To simplify the exposition, we handle volume buy and sell volume densities symmetrically and call the restriction of the functions $v_{b/a}^n$ to volumes standing at non-negative distances from the best bid/ask price the *visible book*. The visible book collects the displayed volumes. The collection of volumes standing at negative distances will be referred to as the *shadow book*. The shadow book specifies the volumes that will be placed into the spread should such an event occur next. It will undergo random fluctuations similar to the visible book and is just a convenient tool to describe the volumes placed into the spread.

Remark 2.1. To obtain a continuous (in space) limiting dynamics, spread placements must be about the same size as volumes standing at the top of the book. In other words, if the limiting volume dynamics is supposed to be continuously distributed (in space), then one has to link volumes *added* to the book to volumes *in* the book taking into account that several price improvements may occur in a row. The shadow book guarantees continuity of the limit. Its precise working will become more clear below. See also [17] for a detailed discussion of the shadow book.

Definition 2.2. The initial LOB state is given by a pair $\left(B_0^n, A_0^n\right)$ of bid and ask prices and two volume density functions $v_{b/a}^n(0,\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.

There are eight events – labeled $\mathbf{M}_{b/a}, \mathbf{L}_{b/a}, \mathbf{C}_{b/a}, \mathbf{P}_{b/a}$ – that change the state of the book. The events $\mathbf{M}_b, \mathbf{L}_b, \mathbf{C}_b, \mathbf{P}_b$ affect the bid side of the book:

$\mathbf{M}_b :=$ {market sell order} $\quad$ $\mathbf{L}_b :=$ {buy limit order placed in the spread}

$\mathbf{C}_b :=$ {cancellation of buy volume} $\quad$ $\mathbf{P}_b :=$ {buy limit order not placed in spread}

The events $\mathbf{M}_a, \mathbf{L}_a, \mathbf{C}_a, \mathbf{P}_a$ affect the ask side of the book:

$\mathbf{M}_a :=$ {market buy order} $\quad$ $\mathbf{L}_a :=$ {sell limit order placed in the spread}

$\mathbf{C}_a :=$ {cancellation of sell volume} $\quad$ $\mathbf{P}_a :=$ {sell limit order not placed in the spread}.

In the sequel we describe how different events change the state of the book. To this end, we denote by $v_{b/a}^n(t,\cdot)$ the volume density function at the bid/ask side at time $t > 0$ and by $(B^n(t), A^n(t))$ the prevailing best bid and ask prices.

2.1.2. *Active orders and price dynamics.* Market order arrivals (Events $\mathbf{M}_{b/a}$) and placements of limit orders in the spread (Events $\mathbf{L}_{b/a}$) lead to price changes. A market order that does not lead to a price change is equivalent to a cancellation of standing volume at the best bid/ask price and will hence be modeled as such. We refer to these order types as *active orders.*

Assumption 1. Active orders arrive according to a Poisson process $\widetilde{N}^n$ with intensity μ^n. The respective active order jump times are denoted by $\left(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$.

We assume that market orders match precisely against the standing volume at the best available prices and that orders placed in the spread are placed at the first best price increment. In other words, a market sell order arriving at time $t > 0$ is good for $v_b^n(t-, B^n(t-)) \cdot \Delta x^n$ shares. A limit buy order placed in the spread at time $t \in (0, T)$ arrives at price level $B^n(t-) - \Delta x^n$ and is good for $v_b^n(t-, B^n(t-) - \Delta x^n) \cdot \Delta x^n$ shares. In particular, an active order moves prices by exactly one tick.

We allow the probabilities of price changes to depend on standing volumes. More precisely, we fix smooth functions with compact support $\varphi^{b/a} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and put

$$Y_t^{b,n} := \langle v_b^n(t, \cdot),\, \varphi^b(B^n(t) + \cdot)\rangle.$$

We interpret $Y_t^{b,n}$ as a measure for the volume standing at or close to the best bid price or the total buy-side volume, depending on the choice of φ^b. The quantity $Y_t^{a,n}$ is defined similarly. The price dynamics is then defined as

$$dB^n(t) = \Delta x^n \xi^n_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}\, d\widetilde{N}^n(t), \tag{1a}$$

$$dA^n(t) = \Delta x^n \xi^n_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}\, d\widetilde{N}^n(t) \tag{1b}$$

where for each $t \geq 0$ the random variable $\xi^n_{b/a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}$ takes values in $\{0, -1, +1\}$ with probabilities that may depend on the prevailing state of the book through $(B^n_{t-}, A^n_{t-}, Y^{b,n}_{t-}, Y^{a,n}_{t-})$. More precisely, denoting by $\mathcal{F}^n$ the filtration generated by the n-th model (see (8) below) we make the following assumption.

Assumption 2. Denote $\overline{\xi}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t)} = (\xi^n_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}, \xi^n_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)})'$. There exist $b^n_{b/a} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $\sigma_n \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^4; \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2})$ such that for any $t > 0$,

$$E_{\mathcal{F}^n_{t-} \vee \sigma(\widetilde{N}^n(t))}\left[\xi^n_{b/a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} b^n_{b/a}(B^n_{t-}, A^n_{t-}, Y^{b,n}_{t-}, Y^{a,n}_{t-}), \tag{2}$$

$$\mathrm{Cov}_{\mathcal{F}^n_{t-} \vee \sigma(\widetilde{N}^n(t))}\left[\overline{\xi}^n_{b/a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)}\right] = \sigma_n \sigma_n'(B^n_{t-}, A^n_{t-}, Y^{b,n}_{t-}, Y^{a,n}_{t-}), \tag{3}$$

and $(b^n_{b/a}, \sigma_n)$ converges to $(b_{b/a}, \sigma)$ in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^4) \times C^1(\mathbb{R}^4; \mathbb{R}^{2\times 2})$. Moreover, we assume that the dynamics is such that bid prices can never become larger than ask prices.

Remark 2.3.
- By construction the sequence of price processes (A^n, B^n) is C-tight (cf. Theorem B.1 and Lemma B.2).
- We may as well allow price changes to depend on finite many "volume statistics" of the form $\left(\langle v^n_{b/a}(t, \cdot),\, \varphi_k^{b/a}(B^n/A^n(t) + \cdot)\rangle\right)_{k=1}^K$ for $K \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Example 2.4. Let us assume that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}^n_{t-} \vee \sigma(\widetilde{N}^n(t))}[\xi^n_{b/a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)} = \pm 1] = g^n_{b/a}(\pm 1, B^n_{t-}, A^n_{t-}, Y^{b,n}_{t-}, Y^{a,n}_{t-})$$

for smooth functions $g^n_{b/a}(\pm 1, \cdot)$ that satisfy for any $(y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) \in \mathbb{R}^4$,

$$g^n_b(+1, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = g^n_a(-1, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = 0, \quad \text{if } y^2 - y^1 < \epsilon \text{ for some } \epsilon > 0$$

and

$$g^n_{b/a}(+1, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) - g^n_{b/a}(-1, y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} b^n_{b/a}(y^1, y^2, y^3, y^4).$$

Then Assumption 2 is satisfied for all sufficiently small tick sizes if $A^n_0 > B^n_0 + \epsilon$. Moreover, $A^n_t - B^n_t \geq \epsilon$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If we further assume that $\xi^n_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t)} \cdot \xi^n_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)} = 0$, then at most one price moves at any active order time.

Remark 2.5. Due to the dependence of price movements on the state of the book, we can guarantee that bid and ask prices never cross. As illustrated by the preceding example the scaling assumptions require the probability of a price increase to be small if a decrease is to be avoided (and vice versa). This problem is not present in *one-sided* LOB models. Another possibility to avoid "crossing of bid/ask prices" is to work within a framework of reflected Brownian motion and to model the (state-independent) price dynamics as follows:

$$dB^n(t) = \frac{\Delta x^n}{2}(\xi_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t)} + \xi_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)})\, d\widetilde{N}^n(t) - \Delta x^n \mathbf{1}_{A^n(t-)-B^n(t-)=\Delta x^n}\, d\widetilde{N}^n(t), \tag{4a}$$

$$dA^n(t) = \frac{\Delta x^n}{2}(\xi_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t)} - \xi_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t)})\, d\widetilde{N}^n(t) + \Delta x^n \mathbf{1}_{A^n(t-)-B^n(t-)=\Delta x^n} d\widetilde{N}^n(t), \tag{4b}$$

where the sequences of random variables $\xi_{b,i}$ and $\xi_{a,i}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, are independent of each other and every other model constituent and take the values ± 1 with probabilities $1/2$, each. It is well known by [20, Theorem 4.3] that the sequence (A^n, B^n) converges weakly to the 2-dimensional reflected Brownian motion (A, B) with

$$dA_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} d\beta^a_t + dL_t; \quad dB_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} d\beta^b_t - dL_t; \quad dL_t = \mathbf{1}_{A_t=B_t} dL_t.$$

The analysis of the joint limit of prices and volumes would be much simpler in this case as the price process would merely specify an exogenous "random environment" for the evolution of volume densities.

Of course, one could even combine a general price dynamics by given in Assumption 2 with reflection as above to guarantee bid prices being smaller than ask prices. The resulting model would be slightly more general, and we expect that our results and proofs would still (mutatis mutandis) hold up to some technicalities.

2.1.3. *Passive orders and volume changes.* Limit order placements outside the spread and cancellations of standing volume do not change prices. We refer to these order types as *passive orders.* In our model cancellations (Events $\mathbf{C}_{b/a}$) occur for random *proportions* of the standing volume while limit order placements outside the spread (Events $\mathbf{P}_{b/a}$) occur for random *volumes* at random price levels.

Assumption 3. Passive orders arrive according to independent Poisson processes N^n_b and N^n_a with intensities λ^n_b and λ^n_a at the buy and sell side of the book, respectively. The corresponding jump times $\left(\tau^n_{b/a,i}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ will be called passive order times.

The *submission and cancellation price levels* are chosen relative to the best prices. Allowing for rather general placement and cancellation dynamics, we assume that the price levels are chosen according to a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $(\pi_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ where each π_i is of the form:

$$\pi_i = \left(\pi_i^{\mathbf{C}_b}, \pi_i^{\mathbf{C}_a}, \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_b}, \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}, \pi_i^{\mathbf{N}_b}, \pi_i^{\mathbf{N}_a}\right). \tag{5}$$

The entries takes values in an interval $[-M, M]$ for some $M > 0$; positive values indicate changes in the visible book while negative values indicate changes in the shadow book. Superscripts indicate event types and '**N**' stands for 'noise'. The precise meaning of the entries will become clear below.

Passive order sizes are described by a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $(\omega_i)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ where each ω_i is of the form

$$\omega_i = \left(\omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_b}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_a}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_b}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_b}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_a}\right). \tag{6}$$

The random variables $\omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_{b/a}}$ take values in $[0,\infty)$; they describe the *sizes* of order placements. Likewise, the random variables $\omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_{b/a}}$ take values in $[0,1]$ and describe the *proportions* of cancellations. Placements and cancellations on both sides of the book are subject to noise. The impact of the noise is described by the non-negative random variables $\omega^{\mathbf{N}_{b/a}}$ and two sequences of i.i.d. random variables $\left(\widetilde{\xi}_{b/a,i}\right)_{i=0}^{\infty}$ where $\widetilde{\xi}_{b/a,i} \in \{-1,+1\}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Specifically, let us assume that the i-th passive order event occurs at time $t > 0$. If

$$\pi_i^{\mathbf{C}_b} = \gamma, \quad \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_b} = \delta, \quad \pi_i^{\mathbf{N}_b} = \zeta$$

then the impact of a cancellation, order placement and noise is felt at the respective price levels

$$l := \left\lfloor \frac{B^n(t-)+\gamma}{\Delta x^n} \right\rfloor, \quad j := \left\lfloor \frac{B^n(t-)+\delta}{\Delta x^n} \right\rfloor, \quad r := \left\lfloor \frac{B^n(t-)+\zeta}{\Delta x^n} \right\rfloor,$$

and the *change* in the bid-side (logarithmic) volume density function is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}(7)\quad v_b^n(t,\cdot) - v_b^n(t-,\cdot) = {} & \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_b} \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n} \mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n, x_{j+1}^n[}(\cdot) + \\ & - \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_b} \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n} v_b^n(t-, B^n(t-)+\gamma) \mathbf{1}_{[x_l^n, x_{l+1}^n[}(\cdot) + \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_b} \widetilde{\xi}_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t-)} \sqrt{\Delta v^n} \mathbf{1}_{[x_r^n, x_{r+1}^n[}(\cdot).\end{aligned}$$

Here Δv^n is a scaling parameter that measures the impact of an individual order on the state of the book. Similar considerations apply to the ask side. For our scaling limit it will be important that the noise parameters $\widetilde{\xi}_{b/a}$ stay constant between two active order times; this explains the random variable $\widetilde{\xi}_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}$ in (7). Note, however, that the "common factor" $\widetilde{\xi}_{a/b}$ is further modulated by the non-negative random variables $\omega^{\mathbf{N}_{a/b}}$, which changes between consecutive passive orders.

Remark 2.6. The frequency of change of the "common factor" $\widetilde{\xi}_{a/b}$ determines the structure of the martingale part of the limiting dynamics. In our case, the martingale part will be an integral with respect to a Wiener process (resulting from the scaling of $\widetilde{\xi}_{a/b}$). If the common factor changes at the same rate at which passive orders arrive, we expect the martingale part to be space-time white noise. This case is left for future research.

Remark 2.7. In real-world markets only one event (market order arrival, cancellation, placement) happens at a time. Within our framework this corresponds to the special case where

$$\pi_k^{\mathbf{C}_{b/a}} = \pi_k^{\mathbf{P}_{b/a}} = \pi_k^{\mathbf{N}_{b/a}},$$

and only one of the random variables $\omega^{\mathbf{C}_{a/b}}, \omega^{\mathbf{P}_{a/b}}$ is different from zero. Our mathematical framework is flexible enough to allow for such correlation. For instance, if only $\omega_k^{\mathbf{C}_b}$ and $\omega_k^{\mathbf{N}_b}$ are different from zero and $\omega_k^{\mathbf{N}_b} = 1$, then the k-th event is a bid-side cancellation at the price level

$$\gamma = \left\lfloor \frac{B^n(t-)+\pi_k^{\mathbf{C}_b}}{\Delta x^n} \right\rfloor$$

and the volume cancelled is:

$$\omega_k^{\mathbf{C}_b} \cdot \Delta v^n \cdot v_b^n(t-, B^n(t-)+\gamma) + \omega_k^{\mathbf{N}_b} \widetilde{\xi}_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t-)} \cdot \sqrt{\Delta v^n} \Delta x^n.$$

Notation 2.8. We introduce the following important short-hand notations:

- For any (deterministic or random) function $u : [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $u(t) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ the function $x \mapsto u(t,x)$ for $t \in [0,\infty)$.

- In the nth model, we denote by $I^n(y)$ the sub-interval of the grid containing $y \in \mathbb{R}$. More precisely, its indicator function is given by
$$\mathbf{1}_{I^n(y)}(x) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n, x_{j+1}^n[}(y)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n, x_{j+1}^n[}(x).$$
- Unless otherwise stated, $(L^p, \|\cdot\|_{L^p})$ $(p \in [1,\infty])$ refers to the space $L^p(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), dx)$.
- For σ-algebras $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ we shall write $E_{\mathcal{G}}[\cdot] := E[\cdot\,|\,\mathcal{G}]$.

For future use, we also introduce the filtration $\mathcal{F}^n$ generated by the n-th model. More precisely, we set

$$\begin{aligned}(8)\quad \mathcal{F}_t^n := \sigma\Big(&\big(\widetilde{N}_s^n\big)_{0\le s\le t}, \big(\xi_{a,k}^n\big)_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^n(t)}, \big(\xi_{b,k}^n\big)_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^n(t)}, \big(N_a^n(s)\big)_{0\le s\le t}, \big(N_b^n(s)\big)_{0\le s\le t}, \big(\omega_k^{\mathbf{C}_a}, \omega_k^{\mathbf{P}_a}, \omega_k^{\mathbf{N}_a}\big)_{k=1}^{N_a^n(t)},\\ &\big(\omega_k^{\mathbf{C}_b}, \omega_k^{\mathbf{P}_b}, \omega_k^{\mathbf{N}_b}\big)_{k=1}^{N_b^n(t)}, \big(\pi_k^{\mathbf{C}_a}, \pi_k^{\mathbf{P}_a}, \pi_k^{\mathbf{N}_a}\big)_{k=1}^{N_a^n(t)}, \big(\pi_k^{\mathbf{C}_b}, \pi_k^{\mathbf{P}_b}, \pi_k^{\mathbf{N}_b}\big)_{k=1}^{N_b^n(t)}, \big(\widetilde{\xi}_{b,k}^n\big)_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}_a^n(t)}, \big(\widetilde{\xi}_{a,k}^n\big)_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}_b^n(t)}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

In terms of the independent Poisson processes $\widetilde{N}^n$ and $N_{b/a}^n$ governing the arrival of active and passive orders, respectively, and the active order arrival times $\big(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n\big)_{i=0}^{\infty}$, the dynamics of the buy and sell side volume density functions follow

$$\begin{aligned}(9a)\quad dv_b^n(t,\cdot) = \Big[&\mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{P}_b}_{N_b^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{P}_b}_{N_b^n(t-)}\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}\\ &- \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{C}_b}_{N_b^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{C}_b}_{N_b^n(t-)} v_b^n(\tau^n_{b,N_b^n(t-)},\cdot)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}\\ &+ \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{N}_b}_{N_b^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{N}_b}_{N_b^n(t-)}\widetilde{\xi}_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}\Big]dN_b^n(t),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(9b)\quad dv_a^n(t,\cdot) = \Big[&\mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{P}_a}_{N_a^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{P}_a}_{N_a^n(t-)}\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}\\ &- \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{C}_a}_{N_a^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{C}_a}_{N_a^n(t-)} v_a^n(\tau^n_{a,N_a^n(t-)},\cdot)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}\\ &+ \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}) + \pi^{\mathbf{N}_a}_{N_a^n(t)}\right)}(\cdot)\omega^{\mathbf{N}_a}_{N_a^n(t-)}\widetilde{\xi}_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(t-)}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}\Big]dN_a^n(t).\end{aligned}$$

The specific structure of the dependence of the (logarithmic) volume density functions on the bid and ask price as well as the random submission price levels reflects the fact the submission and cancellation price levels are chosen relative to the best bid/ask price.

2.2. **The main result.** We prove below that our LOB model converges to a continuous time limit if the order arrival rates tend to infinity and the impact of an individual order arrival on the book as well as the tick size tends to zero in a particular way. In order to make the convergence concept precise, and to state the main result, we need to introduce further notation.

2.2.1. *Preliminaries.* For $m \in (-\infty,\infty)$, we denote by $(H^m, \|\cdot\|_m)$ the space of Bessel potentials equipped with the usual Sobolev norm and inner product. Set

$$\mathcal{E}' = \cup_m H^{-m} \supset \cdots \supset H^{-1} \supset L^2 \supset H^1 \supset \cdots H^2 \supset \cdots \supset \cap_m H^m = \mathcal{E}.$$

It is well known that $H^0 = L^2$ and that $\mathcal{E}$ is a complete separable metric space. Sobolev's embedding theorem indicates that each element of $\mathcal{E}$ is an infinitely differentiable function. In what follows, denote

the dual between $\mathcal{E}'$ and $\mathcal{E}$ by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, which coincides with the inner product of $H^0 = L^2$.

The convergence concept we use is weak convergence in the Skorokhod space $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1})$ of all càdlàg functions on $[0,\infty)$ taking values in the space $\mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1}$. The space $\mathcal{D}$ is equipped with the usual Skorokhod metric (see Jacod and Shiryaev [19]).

2.2.2. *The convergence result.* In order to obtain our convergence result, we need the following assumptions. In particular, we need active and passive orders to arrive on different time scales.

Assumption 4.
- The Poisson processes N_a^n, N_b^n and $\tilde{N}^n$ are independent.
- The scaling parameters $\lambda_{b/a}^n$ (arrival rate of passive orders), μ^n (arrival rate of active orders), Δv^n (order sizes) and Δx^n (tick size) satisfy the following conditions:

$$\lambda_{b/a}^n = n^2; \quad \mu^n = n; \quad \Delta v^n = n^{-2}; \quad \Delta x^n = n^{-1/2}.$$

- For each 'event type' $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{C}_{b/a}, \mathbf{P}_{b/a}, \mathbf{N}_{b/a}$ the random variables $\omega_i^{\mathbf{T}}$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$) are i.i.d. with finite fourth moment, and independent of the Poisson processes N_a^n, N_b^n, and $\widetilde{N}^n$. Moreover, $\omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_{b/a}} \in [0,1]$, $\omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_{b/a}}, \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_{b/a}} \in [0,\infty)$.
- The random variables $\pi_i^{\mathbf{T}}$ are independent of the Poisson processes N_a^n, N_b^n and $\widetilde{N}^n$. They have Lipschitz continuous and hence bounded densities $f^{\mathbf{T}}$ on some compact interval $[-M, M]$.
- The random variables $\widetilde{\xi}_{b/a,i}$ are independent and independent of all other random variables and take the values ± 1 with equal probability.
- The sequence of initial data $(A_0^n, B_0^n, v_a^n(0,\cdot), v_b^n(0,\cdot))$ converges to $(a_0, b_0, v_{a,0}(\cdot), v_{b,0}(\cdot))$ in both $\mathbb{R}^2 \times L^2 \times L^2$ and $\mathbb{R}^2 \times L^\infty \times L^\infty$.

We are now ready to state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.9. *Let Assumptions 1–4 be satisfied. There are three independent Wiener processes $\tilde{W}$, W_a and W_b such that the sequence (A^n, B^n, v_a^n, v_b^n) of stochastic processes converges in distribution in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1})$ to (A, B, v_a, v_b). Here (A, B) is a two-dimensional diffusion process satisfying the SDE*

$$\begin{aligned} dA_t &= b_a(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)dt + \sigma_a(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)d\tilde{W}_t; \quad A_0 = a_0; \\ dB_t &= b_b(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)dt + \sigma_b(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)d\tilde{W}_t; \quad B_0 = b_0; \end{aligned}$$

with $\sigma_a = (\sigma^{11}, \sigma^{12})$, $\sigma_b = (\sigma^{21}, \sigma^{22})$, $Y_t^a = \langle v_a(t,\cdot), \varphi^a(\cdot + A_t)\rangle$ and $Y_t^b = \left\langle v_b(t,\cdot), \varphi^b(\cdot + B_t)\right\rangle$, respectively. Moreover, the logarithms of the volume density processes satisfy the infinite-dimensional SDE

$$\begin{aligned} v_b(t,\cdot) =& v_{b,0}(\cdot) + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_b}] f^{\mathbf{P}_b}(\cdot + B_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_b}] f^{\mathbf{C}_b}(\cdot + B_s) v_b(s,\cdot)\right) ds \\ &+ \sqrt{2} E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_b}\right] \int_0^t f^{\mathbf{N}_b}(\cdot + B_s)\, dW_b(s), \quad t \geq 0; \\ v_a(t,\cdot) =& v_{a,0}(\cdot) + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a}] f^{\mathbf{P}_a}(\cdot + A_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_a}] f^{\mathbf{C}_a}(\cdot + A_s) v_a(s,\cdot)\right) ds \\ &+ \sqrt{2} E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_a}\right] \int_0^t f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(\cdot + A_s)\, dW_a(s), \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For any $T \in (0,\infty)$, existence and uniqueness of an adapted solution to the above coupled SDE system in $L^2(\Omega; C([0,T];\mathbb{R}^2)) \times L^2(\Omega; C([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R}^2)))$ is obvious; see [8] for a general theory on stochastic equations in infinite dimensions. If the model parameters are sufficiently smooth, then the density functions are smooth as well. The following corollary is a consequence of the Itô-Kunita formula.

Corollary 2.10. *If $v_{b/a,0}$ and the densities $f^{\mathbf{T}}$ belong to H^m with $m > 3$, then $v_{b/a}(t)$ take values in H^m and hence by embedding, in $C^2(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, the relative volume processes*

$$(U_a, U_b)(t,x) = (v_a(t, x - A_t), v_b(t, x - B_t)),$$

satisfy the non-local stochastic partial differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}
dU_a(t,x) =& \left[E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a}] f^{\mathbf{P}_a}(x) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_a}] f^{\mathbf{C}_a}(x) U_a(t,x) + DU_a(t,x) b_a(B_t, A_t, \langle U_b(t), \varphi^b\rangle, \langle U_a(t), \varphi^a\rangle)\right] dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} tr\left\{\sigma_a \sigma_a'(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D^2 U_a(t,x)\right\} dt + \sqrt{2} E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_a}\right] f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(x) dW_a(t) \\
&+ DU_a(t,x)\sigma_a(B_t, A_t, \langle U_b(t), \varphi^b\rangle, \langle U_a(t), \varphi^a\rangle)\, d\tilde{W}(s), \quad t \geq 0; \\
U_a(0,x) =& v_{a,0}(x - a_0); \\
dU_b(t,x) =& \left[E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_b}] f^{\mathbf{P}_b}(x) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_b}] f^{\mathbf{C}_b}(x) U_b(t,x) + DU_b(t,x) b_b(B_t, A_t, \langle U_b(t), \varphi^b\rangle, \langle U_a(t), \varphi^a\rangle)\right] dt \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} tr\left\{\sigma_b \sigma_b'(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D^2 U_a(t,x)\right\} dt + \sqrt{2} E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_b}\right] f^{\mathbf{N}_b}(x) dW_b(t) \\
&+ DU_b(t,x)\sigma_b(B_t, A_t, \langle U_b(t), \varphi^b\rangle, \langle U_a(t), \varphi^a\rangle)\, d\tilde{W}(s), \quad t \geq 0; \\
U_b(0,x) =& v_{b,0}(x - b_0),
\end{aligned}$$

which is coupled with the SDE for the price system given in Theorem 2.9.

2.3. **Outline of the proof.** The proof of Theorem 2.9 is carried out in the following sections. To main challenge is convergence, especially tightness of the volume densities. It turns out that tightness of the volume densities is guaranteed under minimal assumptions on the price process. Since the price process is C-tight by construction tightness of the volume process implies tightness of the price-volume process and hence existence of an accumulation point. For the convenience of the reader we now give a brief outline of our convergence proof.

2.3.1. *Some auxiliary processes.* We split the dynamics of the (logarithmic) volume density functions into three processes, which we are going to handle separately, before finally pasting them back together to obtain the result for the full dynamics.

From equation (9a) we identify the following three processes which drive the evolution of the bid-side volume density function:

$$V_b^{n,1}(t,x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_b^n(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{b,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_b}\right)}(x) \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_b} \frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}, \tag{10a}$$

$$V_b^{n,2}(t,x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_b^n(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(A^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{b,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{C}_b}\right)}(x) \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_b} \frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}, \tag{10b}$$

$$V_b^{n,3}(t,x) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_b^n(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{b,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{N}_b}\right)}(x) \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_b} \widetilde{\xi}_{b,\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{b,i})+1} \sqrt{\Delta\nu^n}, \tag{10c}$$

corresponding to the volume changes due to incoming order placements ($V_b^{n,1}$), the proportional cancellations of standing volume ($V_b^{n,2}$) and aggregated random fluctuations ($V_b^{3,n}$). We notice that $V_b^{n,1}$ and $V_b^{n,2}$ are increasing functions in time for each n. The process $V_b^{n,3}$ will contribute the martingale part in the continuous scaling limit.[2] We introduce similar processes $V_a^{n,1}$, $V_a^{n,2}$ and $V_a^{n,3}$ for the ask side.

2.3.2. *'Markovization' and time-change.* The previously introduced processes are not convenient for characterizing the limit process. The discrete processes $v_{b/a}^n$ and $V_{b/a}^{n,1/2/3}$ are not Markov chains, and $V^{n,3}$ fails to be a martingale. The 'markovization' is achieved by registering changes to the processes $V_{b/a}^{n,i}$ and $v_{b/a}^n$ only along the Poisson process $\widetilde{N}$. To this end, we introduce the following processes (making use of our short-hand notations):

$$\widehat{v}_{b/a}^n(t) := v_{b/a}^n(\widetilde{\tau}_{k-1}^n), \quad \widehat{V}_{b/a}^{n,i}(t) := V_{b/a}^{n,i}(\widetilde{\tau}_{k-1}^n), \quad \widetilde{\tau}_{k-1}^n \le t < \widetilde{\tau}_k^n, \tag{11}$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Note that we have, for instance,

$$\widehat{V}_b^{n,1}(t,x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}_t^n} \sum_{i=N_b^n(\widetilde{\tau}_{k-1}^n)+1}^{N_b^n(\widetilde{\tau}_k^n)} \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_b} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(B^n(\widetilde{\tau}_{k-1})+\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_b}\right)}(x) \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}.$$

Obviously, together with $\left((A^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n), B^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n)\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ the processes

$$\left\{\left(\widehat{v}_b^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n,\cdot), \widehat{v}_a^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n,\cdot)\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{\left(\widehat{v}_b^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n,\cdot), \widehat{v}_a^n(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n,\cdot), \widehat{V}_{b/a}^{n,1/2/3}(\widetilde{\tau}_i^n,\cdot)\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}\right\}$$

are Markov processes, and $\widehat{V}_{b/a}^{n,3}$ is, in fact, a martingale. Thus, some classical methods of, e.g., [23], are, in principle, applicable to these processes. Nonetheless, we find it useful to add yet another layer of auxiliary processes, this time by separating out active order times, i.e., by considering the process as if active order times were deterministic. More precisely, we define the time-change $\overline{\eta}$ together with its inverse η by

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\eta}_u^n &:= \widetilde{\tau}_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}^n, \quad u \in [0,\infty); \\ \eta_u^n &:= \inf\{t : t > 0, \overline{\eta}_t^n > u\} - \frac{1}{n}, \quad u \in [0,\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Lemma 2.11. *The sequence of processes η^n converges almost surely to the identity function uniformly on compact time intervals.*

Proof. According to a strong approximation result, due to Kurtz [22], a standard Poisson process (N_t) can be realized on the same probability space as a Brownian motion (W_t) in such a way that the random variable

$$X := \sup_{t\ge 0} \frac{|N_t - t - W_t|}{\log(\max\{2,t\})}$$

has finite moment generating function in the neighborhood of the origin and hence finite mean. In particular, X is almost surely finite. Thus, the assertion follows from the law of iterated logarithm for Brownian motion. □

[2]Note that $V_b^{n,3}$ itself is *not* a martingale (in the filtration $\mathcal{F}^n$ generated by the full model), as the fluctuations $\widetilde{\xi}$ are constant between two active order times.

New processes are now defined which correspond to the "hat" processes when evaluated on the time-scale η^n. More precisely, we put:

$$\bar{A}^n(u) := A_0^n + \Delta x^n \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nu \rfloor} \xi_{a,i}^n \tag{13a}$$

$$\bar{B}^n(u) := B_0^n + \Delta x^n \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nu \rfloor} \xi_{b,i}^n \tag{13b}$$

$$\overline{V}_a^{n,1}(u,x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(\bar{\tau}_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}^n)} \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}^a} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}^a}\right)}(x) \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}, \tag{13c}$$

$$\overline{V}_a^{n,2}(u,x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(\bar{\tau}_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}^n)} \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}^a} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{C}^a}\right)}(x) \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}, \tag{13d}$$

$$\overline{V}_a^{n,3}(u,x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(\bar{\tau}_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}^n)} \omega_i^{\mathbf{N}^a} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{N}^a}\right)}(x) \widetilde{\xi}_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})+1} \sqrt{\Delta v^n}, \tag{13e}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{v}_a^n(u,x) := v_a^n(0,x) + \overline{V}_a^{n,1}(u,x) + \overline{V}_a^{n,3}(u,x) \\ - \sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(\bar{\tau}_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}^n)} \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{C}^a}\right)}(x) v_a^n(\tau_{a,i}^n, x) \frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n},\end{aligned} \tag{13f}$$

and similarly for the bid side. Thus, we have the desired property that, for instance, $(A^n, B^n, \widehat{v}_{b/a}^n)(u) = (\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{v}_{b/a}^n)(\eta_u^n)$ and that $\left((\bar{A}_{i/n}^n, \bar{B}_{i/n}^n, \overline{v}_b^n(i/n,\cdot), \overline{v}_a^n(i/n,\cdot))\right)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ is a Markov chain.

2.3.3. *Structure of the proof.* With these preparations we can now describe the structure of the proof. C-tightness of (A^n, B^n) is clear, as already remarked in Remark 2.3. Hence, we first prove tightness of each of the processes $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,i}$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ and of $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$ in the distributional sense indicated above. For this part, we heavily rely on Mitoma's theorem (Theorem B.3) together with Kurtz's criterion (Theorem B.1). This first part is presented in Section 3.1, see Proposition 3.8.

The natural next step would be to extend the tightness result for $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$ to $\widehat{v}_{b/a}^n$ and, subsequently, to $v_{b/a}^n$. However, it turns out that this extension requires C-tightness of $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$. Hence, in Section 3.2, we instead characterize the limit $\overline{v}_{b/a}$ of $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$, depending on the yet unknown limiting price process (A, B).

Finally, in the third step presented in Section 3.3 we extend the tightness to $\widehat{v}_{b/a}^n$ and prove tightness of $v_{b/a}^n$. In fact, we thereby also obtain the limits for these processes; as it turns out, the processes $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$, $\widehat{v}_{b/a}^n$ and $v_{b/a}^n$ must all have the same limit. In some more detail, we first show the joint convergence (in a weak sense) of

$$\left(\overline{v}_{b/a}^n\,,\, \eta^n\right) \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} (\overline{v}_{b/a}\,,\, \mathrm{id})\,.$$

By a theorem of Billingsley ([3, Lemma on p. 151]), this implies that (in the appropriate weak sense)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{v}_{b/a}^n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \overline{v}_{b/a}^n \circ (\eta^n) = \overline{v}_{b/a}.$$

Note that for this implication we need C-tightness of the sequence $\overline{v}^n_{b/a}$. Then we prove the tightness of $v^n_{b/a}$ and further verify that $\widehat{v}^n_{b/a} - v^n_{b/a}$ converges to 0 in an $L^2(\Omega; L^2(\mathbb{R}))$-sense, thereby implying that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} v^n_{b/a} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \widehat{v}^n_{b/a} = \overline{v}_{b/a}.$$

At this stage, we have only treated the convergence of each of the individual sequences of processes (A^n, B^n, v^n_b) and (A^n, B^n, v^n_a) to some limiting processes. However, as all these limiting processes are actually continuous, joint tightness and, finally, joint weak convergence of $\left(A^n, B^n, v^n_b, v^n_a\right)$ therefore follows by Corollary B.4. The last step, performed in Section 4 is then to characterize the limit of the price processes, and consequently, of the full model.

3. The scaling limit of the volume density

In this section, we prove weak convergence in a distributional sense of the volume density function. Throughout, we use the symbol C for deterministic constants which may change from occurrence to occurrence.

Remark 3.1. While we do not yet know at this point whether there is a unique accumulation point of the sequence of processes (A^n, B^n), we *do* know that there are such accumulation points and all these points are processes, which are continuous in time. By choosing a proper sub-sequence, we can, therefore, assume that (A^n, B^n) does converge to a continuous limiting process (A, B), and we will often do so in this section.

3.1. Tightness of the auxiliary process $\overline{v}^n_{b/a}$.

We first prove tightness of the processes $\overline{v}^n_{b/a}$. The arguments are the same for the bid and ask side of the book. To ease notation we therefore drop the index indicating bid/ask side volumes in what follows.

Notation 3.2. Where appropriate (i.e., when there is only a negligible chance of confusion and where all considerations can be trivially generalized to all relevant processes), we shall adopt the following notations:

- We drop the superscript "n" (referring to the place in the model hierarchy) as well as the subscript "a" or "b" and any other indices, which are not essential in the respective context. E.g., we may write $\overline{V}^2$ or even just $\overline{V}$ instead of $\overline{V}^{n,2}_b$.
- We may denote by A or $\bar{A}$ either the ask or the bid price.
- We may denote the random location of any activity in the book by π or π_i and its size by ω or ω_i, disregarding the type of activity and whether the sell or buy sides are involved.

We start with an elementary auxiliary lemma on the distribution of a Poisson process as seen from a second, independent Poisson process. The lemma will be key to compute the distribution of passive order arrivals between two consecutive active order times.

Lemma 3.3. *Let N_1 and N_2 be two independent Poisson processes with intensities λ_1 and λ_2, respectively. Moreover, let T_i, $i = 1, \ldots$, denote the jump times of the Poisson process N_1. For any $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots$, the random variable $N_2(T_\alpha)$ has a negative binomial (NB) distribution with parameters $r = \alpha$ and $p = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}$, i.e., we have*

$$P\left(N_2(T_\alpha) = l\right) = \binom{l+\alpha-1}{\alpha-1}\left(\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\right)^l\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\right)^\alpha, \quad l = 0, 1, \ldots$$

In particular, the moment-generating function reads

$$Ee^{tN_2(T_\alpha)} = \left(\frac{1-p}{1-pe^t}\right)^\alpha, \quad \textit{for } t < -\log\ p,$$

and

$$E\left[N_2(T_\alpha)\right] = \alpha\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1},$$

$$E\left[N_2(T_\alpha)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-1\right)\right] = \alpha(1+\alpha)\frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1^2},$$

$$E\left[N_2(T_\alpha)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-1\right)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-2\right)\right] = \alpha(1+\alpha)(2+\alpha)\frac{\lambda_2^3}{\lambda_1^3},$$

$$E\left[N_2(T_\alpha)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-1\right)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-2\right)\left(N_2(T_\alpha)-3\right)\right] = \alpha(1+\alpha)(2+\alpha)(3+\alpha)\frac{\lambda_2^4}{\lambda_1^4}.$$

In the next lemma, we provide growth estimates for the processes $\overline{V}^{n,1/2}$. As the growth mechanism for these processes (but not for $\overline{V}^{n,3}$) work in the same way, we merge the discussions into one lemma. Denote by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n$ the filtration generated by the processes $\overline{V}^{n,1/2/3}_{a/b}$ and $\overline{\nu}^n_{a/b}$.

Lemma 3.4. *There is a constant $C > 0$ (independent of n, s, t) such that we can bound*

$$E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\left\|\overline{V}^{n,1/2}(t,\cdot) - \overline{V}^{n,1/2}(s,\cdot)\right\|^2_{L^2}\right] \le C\left((t-s)^2 + \frac{|t-s|}{n}\right),$$

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\left(\overline{V}^{n,1/2}(t,x) - \overline{V}^{n,1/2}(s,x)\right)^2\right] \le C\left((t-s)^2 + \frac{|t-s|}{n}\right),$$

$$E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\left\|\overline{V}^{n,1/2}(t,\cdot) - \overline{V}^{n,1/2}(s,\cdot)\right\|^4_{L^4}\right] \le C\left((t-s)^4 + \frac{|t-s|^3}{n} + \frac{|t-s|^2}{n^2} + \frac{|t-s|}{n^3}\right),$$

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\left(\overline{V}^{n,1/2}(t,x) - \overline{V}^{n,1/2}(s,x)\right)^4\right] \le C\left((t-s)^4 + \frac{|t-s|^3}{n} + \frac{|t-s|^2}{n^2} + \frac{|t-s|}{n^3}\right).$$

Proof. Without any loss of generality, we can choose $s = 0$. Moreover, following the notation convention adopted above, we drop the super-scripts from all the processes and random variables and denote by "A" either bid or ask price, respectively. Let $\alpha := \lfloor nt \rfloor$ and consider

$$E\left[\overline{V}(t,x)^2\right] = E\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{I\left(\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\omega_i\right)^2\right]\left(\frac{\Delta\nu}{\Delta x}\right)^2.$$

Using the fact that the random variables ω_i are i.i.d. and independent from all the other random terms above, we get

$$E\left[\overline{V}(t,x)^2\right] = E\Bigg[\sum_{i<j;i,j=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)} 2E_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_i}\vee\sigma(\pi_i,\omega_i,\bar{A}_{\eta_{\tau_i}})}\left[\omega_j\mathbf{1}_{I\left(\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_j})+\pi_j\right)}(x)\right]\omega_i\mathbf{1}_{I\left(\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})+\pi_i\right)}(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)} E_{\mathcal{G}}\left[\omega_i^2\right]\mathbf{1}_{I\left(\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\Bigg]\left(\frac{\Delta\nu}{\Delta x}\right)^2.$$

Again using independence of π_i, $\pi_{i'}$ and all the other random variables, we can bound

$$E\left[\mathbf{1}_{I(y+\pi_i)}(x)\right] \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x \mathbf{1}_{[y-M,y+M]}(x). \tag{14a}$$

Conditioning on the σ-algebra generated by all sources of randomness *except* $(\pi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$, these bounds enable us to estimate:

$$E\left[\overline{V}(t,x)^2\right] \leq E\Bigg[2E\left[\omega_1\right]^2\|f\|_{L^\infty}^2\Delta x^2\sum_{i<j;i,j=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)}\mathbf{1}_{[\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})-M,\,\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})+M]}(x)+$$
$$+E\left[\omega_1^2\right]\|f\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x\sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)}\mathbf{1}_{\left[\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})-M,\,\bar{A}(\eta_{\tau_i})+M\right]}(x)\Bigg]\left(\frac{\Delta v}{\Delta x}\right)^2.$$

At this stage, we can easily bound $\overline{V}$ both in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and as a supremum in x. More precisely, we have

$$E\left[\left\|\overline{V}(t)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E\left[\overline{V}(t,x)^2\right]\leq(2M+1)\Big(E[\omega_1]^2\|f\|_{L^\infty}^2\Delta x^2E\left[N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)\left(N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)-1\right)\right]+$$
$$+E\left[\omega_1^2\right]\|f\|_{L^\infty}\Delta xE\left[N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)\right]\Big)\left(\frac{\Delta v}{\Delta x}\right)^2.$$

Finally, inserting the moment formulas given in Lemma 3.3 and applying the trivial estimate $\alpha=\lfloor nt\rfloor\leq nt$ together with Assumption 4, we arrive at

$$E\left[\left\|\overline{V}(t)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E\left[\overline{V}(t,x)^2\right]\leq Cn^{-7/2}\left\{n^{-1/2}nt(1+nt)\frac{n^4}{n^2}+nt\frac{n^2}{n}\right\}=C\left(t^2+(n^{-1}+n^{-3/2})t\right)\leq C\left(t^2+\frac{t}{n}\right).$$

The estimate for the fourth moment follows analogously and is therefore skipped. □

The growth bound for $\overline{V}^{n,3}$ works, in principle, similarly. Note, however, that the scaling for $\overline{V}^{n,3}$ is much smaller. Hence, we need to take advantage of the martingale-difference structure in order to avoid the mixed terms in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.5. *There is a constant C (independent of n, s, t) such that*

$$E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s^n}\left[\sup_{s\leq u\leq t}\left\|\overline{V}^{n,3}(u)-\overline{V}^{n,3}(s)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s^n}\left[\sup_{s\leq u\leq t}\left|\overline{V}^{n,3}(u)-\overline{V}^{n,3}(s)\right|^2\right]\leq C|t-s|, \tag{15}$$

$$E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s^n}\left[\sup_{s\leq u\leq t}\left\|\overline{V}^{n,3}(u)-\overline{V}^{n,3}(s)\right\|_{L^4}^4\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s^n}\left[\sup_{s\leq u\leq t}\left|\overline{V}^{n,3}(u)-\overline{V}^{n,3}(s)\right|^4\right]\leq C\left((t-s)^2+\frac{|t-s|}{n}\right). \tag{16}$$

Proof. Again, we restrict ourselves to proving the case $s=0$, and we drop all indices from the notation. Re-writing $\overline{V}$ in a form more clearly expressing its martingale structure, we consider

$$\overline{V}(t)=\sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_\alpha)}\mathbf{1}_{I\left(\bar{A}(\eta^n_{\tau^n_i})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\omega_i\widetilde{\xi}_{\widetilde{N}(\tau_i)}\sqrt{\Delta v}=\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\sum_{i=N(\overline{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{j+1})}\mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_i)}(x)\omega_i\widetilde{\xi}_j\sqrt{\Delta v},$$

where we again use the short-hand notation $\alpha=\lfloor tn\rfloor$. Using Doob's inequality and the fact that $E\left[\widetilde{\xi}_i\widetilde{\xi}_j\right]=\delta_{ij}$ with $\widetilde{\xi}_i^2=1$, we have

$$E\left[\sup_{0\leq u\leq t}|\overline{V}(u,x)|^2\right]\leq 4E\left[|\overline{V}(t,x)|^2\right]$$

$$= 4\Delta v E\left[\left(\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\widetilde{\xi}_j \sum_{i=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})} \mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_i)}(x)\omega_i\right)^2\right]$$

$$= 4\Delta v E\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\left(\sum_{i=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})} \mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_i)}(x)\omega_i\right)^2\right].$$

Next, we estimate the contribution of the random locations π as in (14). We have:

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}\left\|\overline{V}(u)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right] \le 4\Delta v E\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\left\{\sum_{i\neq i'=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}\omega_i\omega_{i'}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_i)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_{i'})}(x)\,dx\right\}\right]+$$

$$+\sum_{i=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}\omega_i^2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathbf{1}_{I(\bar{A}(j/n)+\pi_i)}(x)\,dx\Bigg]$$

$$\le 4\Delta v E\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\left\{\sum_{i\neq i'=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}E[\omega_1]^2\left\|f\right\|_{L^\infty}^2\Delta x^2(2M)+\sum_{i=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}E[\omega_1^2]\left\|f\right\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x(2M)\right\}\right],$$

and similarly,

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}|\overline{V}(u,x)|^2\right] \le 4\Delta v E\left[\sum_{j=0}^{\alpha-1}\left\{\sum_{i\neq i'=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}E[\omega_1]^2\left\|f\right\|_{L^\infty}^2\Delta x^2+\sum_{i=N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)+1}^{N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})}E[\omega_1^2]\left\|f\right\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x\right\}\right].$$

Since the distribution of the increments $N(\widetilde{\tau}_{j+1})-N(\widetilde{\tau}_j)$ does not depend on j, we see that

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}\left\|\overline{V}(u)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}|\overline{V}(u,x)|^2\right]$$

$$\le\ C\,\Delta v E\left[\alpha\left\{E[\omega_1]^2\left\|f^\pi\right\|_{L^\infty}^2(\Delta x)^2N(\widetilde{\tau}_1)\left(N(\widetilde{\tau}_1)-1\right)+E\left[\omega_1^2\right]\left\|f^\pi\right\|_{L^\infty}\Delta xN(\widetilde{\tau}_1)\right\}\right].$$

Again appealing to Lemma 3.3 (with $\alpha=1$) together with Assumption 4, we obtain

$$E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}\left\|\overline{V}(u)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]+\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}|\overline{V}(u,x)|^2\right]\le C\frac{1}{n^2}nt\left\{\frac{2}{n}\frac{n^4}{n^2}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\frac{n^2}{n}\right\}=Ct\{2+1/\sqrt{n}\}\le Ct.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.4, the estimate for the fourth moment follows by the similar arguments. □

At this stage we can patch together the growth bounds of Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 to obtain a similar growth bound for the process $\overline{v}^n$. The proof is based on an event-by-event decomposition of the limit order book dynamics. More precisely, in terms of the increments

$$h_{a,i}^{n,1}(x) := \omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}\mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}\right)}(x)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n},$$

$$h_{a,i}^{n,2}(x) := \omega_i^{\mathbf{C}_a}\mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{C}_a}\right)}(x)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n},$$

$$h_{a,i}^{n,3}(x) := \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\bar{A}^n\left(\eta^n_{\tau^n_{a,i}}\right)+\pi_i^{\mathbf{N}_a}\right)}(x)\omega_i^{\mathbf{N}_a}\widetilde{\xi}_{a,\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})+1}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}$$

of the processes $\overline{V}_a^{n,j}$ $(j = 1, 2, 3)$ – and similarly for the buy-side – one has the following decomposition of the LOB dynamics:

$$\overline{v}^n(t,x) = \prod_{i=1}^{N^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})} \left(1 - h_i^{n,2}(x)\right)\overline{v}^n(0,x) + \\ + \prod_{i=1}^{N^n_{a/b}(\overline{\tau}^n_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})} \left(1 - h_i^{n,2}(x)\right)\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})} \frac{1}{\prod_{m=1}^{i}\left(1 - h_m^{n,2}(x)\right)}\left(h_i^{n,1}(x) + h_i^{n,3}(x)\right)\right] \tag{17}$$

Clearly, $h_i^{n,1}$ is the effect of the placement at the i'th passive order event, $h_i^{n,3}$ the fluctuation effect, whereas $h_i^{n,2}$ is the proportion of standing volume canceled.

Lemma 3.6. *There is a sequence of non-negative adapted process C_t^n and a deterministic constant C such that for $p \in \{2, 4\}$*

$$E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\sup_{s\le r\le t}\left\|\overline{v}^n(r) - \overline{v}^n(s)\right\|^p_{L^p}\right] + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s}\left[\sup_{s\le r\le t}\left|\overline{v}^n(r,x) - \overline{v}^n(s,x)\right|^p\right] \le C^n_s\left((t-s)^p + (t-s)\right)$$

with

$$\sup_n E\left[\sup_{0\le s\le t} C^n_s\right] \le C(t^p + t). \tag{18}$$

Proof. We may again drop the dependence on n from the notation and w.l.o.g. assume $s = 0$. Note that $0 \le 1 - h_i^2(x) \le 1$ and

$$\left|\prod_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})}(1 - h_i^2(x)) - 1\right| \le \sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})} h_i^2(x) = \overline{V}^2(t,x).$$

Hence, (17) together with Lemma 3.4 and 3.5 implies that for $p \in \{2, 4\}$,

$$|\overline{v}(t,x) - \overline{v}(0,x)|^p = \left|\left(\prod_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})}\left(1 - h_i^2\right) - 1\right)\overline{v}(0,x) + \prod_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})}\left(1 - h_i^2\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N(\overline{\tau}_{\lfloor nt\rfloor})}\frac{1}{\prod_{m=1}^{i}\left(1 - h_i^2\right)}\left(h_i^1 + h_i^3\right)\right)\right|^p$$
$$\le C\left\{|\overline{v}(0,x)|^p \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\left(\overline{V}^2(t,x)\right)^p + \left|\overline{V}^1(t,x)\right|^p + \sup_{0\le s\le t}\left|\overline{V}^3(s,x)\right|^p\right\}.$$

It then follows that for $p \in \{2, 4\}$,

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}|\overline{v}(u,x) - \overline{v}(0,x)|^p\right] + E\left[\sup_{0\le u\le t}\|\overline{v}(u) - \overline{v}(0)\|^p_{L^p}\right] \le C\left(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|\overline{v}(0,x)|^p + \|\overline{v}(0)\|^p_{L^p} + 1\right)(t^p + t).$$

For a general $s \in [0, t]$, this only proves the estimate for a $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^n_s$-measurable random variable C^n_s which depends in an affine way on $\|\overline{v}(s)\|_{L^2}$. Note, however, that the above estimate also implies that for $p \in \{2, 4\}$

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}^+}\left(E\left[\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left\|\overline{v}^n_{a/b}(s)\right\|^p_{L^p}\right] + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left[\sup_{0\le s\le t}\left|\overline{v}^n_{a/b}(s,x)\right|^p\right]\right) < C(t^p + t),$$

so that we can, indeed, find a deterministic constant C which is independent of s, t and n and bounds $E\left[\sup_{0\le s\le t} C^n_s\right] \le C(t^p + t)$. □

Remark 3.7. In a similar way to the above proof, we obtain for $p \in \{2,4\}$ and $k = 0,1,2,\cdots$,

$$E\left[\sup_{i\in[N_a^n(\overline{\tau}_k^n),\, N_a^n(\overline{\tau}_{k+1}^n)]\cap\mathbb{N}^+} \|v_a^n(\tau_{a,i}) - v_a^n(\eta_k^n)\|_{L^p}^p\right] + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left[\sup_{i\in[N_a^n(\overline{\tau}_k^n),\, N_a^n(\overline{\tau}_{k+1}^n)]\cap\mathbb{N}^+} \left|v_a^n(\tau_{a,i},x) - v_a^n(\overline{\tau}_k^n,x)\right|^p\right] \le C\frac{t+t^p}{n},$$

where the constant C is independent of n, k and t.

We are now ready to state and prove the main result of this section.

Proposition 3.8. *The processes* $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$, $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,1}$, $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,2}$ *and* $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,3}$ *are tight as processes with paths in* $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); H^{-1}\right)$.

Proof. For $X^n \in \{\overline{v}_{b/a}^n, \overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,1}, \overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,2}, \overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,3}\}$, according to the definition it is obvious that the tightness of X^n is equivalent to that of $((1+t)^{-1}X^n(t))_{t\in[0,\infty)}$ which we denote again by X^n. The reason why we scale the processes this way is that estimate (18) prevents us from applying Theorem B.1 directly to the original processes.

By Mitoma's theorem (see Theorem B.3), we need to prove tightness of the processes $\langle X^n, \phi\rangle$ for any test function $\phi \in \mathcal{E} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}, dx)$, for which we, in turn, will appeal to Kurtz's criterion (see Theorem B.1). Hence, we need to estimate

$$E_{\mathcal{F}_s^n}\left[\langle X^n(t) - X^n(s), \phi\rangle^2\right].$$

As each of the processes $\overline{v}^n, \overline{V}^{n,1}, \overline{V}^{n,2}, \overline{V}^{n,3}$ takes values in L^2, the bracket $\langle X^n, \phi\rangle$ is equal to the L^2 inner product $\langle X^n, \phi\rangle_{L^2}$, and so we can estimate

$$E_{\mathcal{F}_s^n}\left[\langle X^n(t) - X^n(s), \phi\rangle^2\right] \le E_{\mathcal{F}_s^n}\left[\left\|X^n(t) - X^n(s)\right\|_{L^2}^2\right]\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2 \le \sup_{\tau\in[0,\infty)}(1+\tau)^{-2}C_\tau^n\left[(t-s)^2 + (t-s)\right]\|\phi\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The second condition of Theorem B.1 follows with $\gamma_n(\delta) = \sup_{\tau\in[0,\infty)}(1+\tau)^{-2}C_\tau^n(\delta^2+\delta)$ by Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6.

For the first condition, i.e., tightness of the sequence of random variables $\langle X^n(t), \phi\rangle$ for each (rational) t, we note that this trivially follows from uniform boundedness of the sequence of random variables $\langle X^n(t), \phi\rangle$ in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Moreover, for any $T \in (0,\infty)$, we have by Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6,

$$\sup_n E \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|X^n(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \le C(T + T^2),$$

with the constant C being independent of n and T. It follows that for $N \in (0,\infty)$,

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|X^n(t)\|_{L^2}^2 > N\right) \le \frac{C(T+T^2)}{N} \to 0, \quad \text{as } N \to \infty.$$

By Theorems B.1 and B.3, X^n and hence $\overline{v}_{b/a}^n$, $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,1}$, $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,2}$ and $\overline{V}_{b/a}^{n,3}$ are tight as sequences of processes with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); H^{-1}\right)$. □

Remark 3.9. This proof *almost* gives us tightness in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R})\right)$ for $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ equipped with the weak topology. Note, however, that $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is not a metric space when equipped with the weak topology. Hence we cannot use Kurtz's criterion as it does not apply to non-metric state spaces.

3.2. **Characterization of the limit of $\overline{\nu}^n_{b/a}$.** In this section, we characterize the limit of the sequence $\overline{\nu}^n_{b/a}$. We give the arguments for the ask side and write $\mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ for $\mathbf{P}_a$, $\mathbf{C}_a$ and $\mathbf{N}_a$. The arguments for the bid side are identical. We start with establishing joint convergence in distribution of bid/ask prices along with the aggregate fluctuations of standing volumes on the ask side of the book.

Proposition 3.10. *There is a Wiener process* $\{W_a(t); t \in [0,\infty)\}$ *such that* $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}^{n,3}_a) \Rightarrow (A, B, \overline{V}^3_a)$, *with* (A, B) *being a two-dimensional continuous process, and*

$$\overline{V}^3_a(t) = \sqrt{2}E\left[\omega^{\mathbf{N}}_1\right]\int_0^t f^{\mathbf{N}}(x + A_s)\, dW_a(s), \quad t \in [0,\infty).$$

Proof. Combining Proposition 3.8, Corollary B.4 and C-tightness of (A^n, B^n), we conclude that $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}^{n,3}_a)$ is tight as a sequence of processes with paths lying in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty); \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1})$ and that $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n)$ converges in distribution to a two-dimensional continuous process (A, B) — at least if we run along a sub-sequence. By Skorohod's lemma, we may assume that all random variables and processes are defined on a common probability space, and – restricting to a subsequence if necessary – that the sequence $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}^{n,3}_a)$ converges with probability 1 to $(A, B, \overline{V}^3_a)$ as a sequence of processes whose sample paths belong to $\mathcal{D}(0,\infty; \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1})$.

Since the sequence of price processes is C-tight and converges to (A, B) it is sufficient to characterize the weak accumulation point $\overline{V}^3_a$. To this end, we assume w.l.o.g. that $f^{\mathbf{N}_a}$ is not identically equal to zero and that $E[\omega^{\mathbf{N}_a}_1] > 0$. We now proceed in several steps.

i) First, we define, for any $\phi \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\overline{Y}^n_t(\phi) = \langle \phi, \overline{V}^{n,3}_a(t)\rangle, \quad t \in [0,\infty),$$

and denote by $\mathcal{G}^n$ the filtration generated by the processes $(\bar{A}^n_t, \bar{B}^n_t, \overline{V}^{n,3}(t))$. Note that the sequence $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{Y}^n(\phi))$ converges with probability 1 to $(A, B, \bar{Y}(\phi))$ where $\bar{Y}(\phi) := \langle \phi, \overline{V}^3_a\rangle$ as a sequence of processes whose sample paths belong to $\mathcal{D}(0,\infty; \mathbb{R}^3)$.

We are now going to use Lemma C.1 to show that $Y(\phi)$ admits a representation in terms of a Brownian integral. For this, we assume that $\phi \geq 0$; otherwise, we make the decomposition $\phi = \phi^+ - \phi^-$ and consider ϕ^+ and ϕ^- respectively, just noting that both ϕ^+ and ϕ^- belong to H^1. Let

$$a^n_0(\phi)(\cdot) := \Big(\sum_j \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} f(x+\cdot)\, dx \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} \phi(x)\, dx\Big)^2 (\Delta x^n)^{-2} E\left[\omega^{\mathbf{N}}_1\right]^2,$$

$$a^n_1(\phi)(\cdot) := \sum_j \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} f(x+\cdot)\, dx \Big| \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} \phi(x)\, dx\Big|^2 (\Delta x^n)^{-2} E\left[(\omega^{\mathbf{N}}_1)^2\right]$$

$$\sigma^n(\phi)(\cdot) := \left\{\left(2a^n_0 + \frac{1}{n}a^n_1\right)(\cdot)\right\}^{1/2},$$

with $f = f^{\mathbf{N}_a}$. Since the number of passive order arrivals $\left(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}}\right)$ on $[\frac{k-1}{n}, \frac{k}{n})$ follows a negative binomial distribution $\mathrm{NB}\left(1, \frac{\lambda^n}{\lambda^n+\mu^n}\right)$ (see Lemma 3.3), we have:

$$E_{\mathcal{G}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}}\left[|\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}(\phi)|^2\right]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \Delta v^n \Big\{ \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} \Big) \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} - 1 \Big) \Big(\sum_j \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}})\, dx \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} \phi(x)\, dx \Big)^2 E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}}\right]^2 \\
&\quad + \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} \Big) \sum_j \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}})\, dx \Big| \int_{x^n_j}^{x^n_{j+1}} \phi(x)\, dx \Big|^2 E\left[\left(\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}}\right)^2 \right] \Big\} \\
&= \Delta v^n (\Delta x^n)^2 \Big\{ \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} \Big) \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} - 1 \Big) a^n_0(\phi)(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}) + \Big(N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} \Big) a^n_1(\phi) \Big(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}} \Big) \Big\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3} \Big(2n^2 a^n_0(\phi) + n a^n_1(\phi) \Big) \Big(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}} \Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \Big(\sigma^n(\phi) \Big(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}} \Big) \Big)^2 . \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}
$$

Set

$$
\sigma(\phi)(\cdot) = \sqrt{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(x + \cdot)\phi(x)\, dx E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}}\right], \quad t \in [0, \infty).
$$

Note that $\sigma \geq 0$ since ϕ is nonnegative. If we can verify the following conditions for any $t > 0$:

$$
E\left[\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left| \sigma^n(\phi) \Big(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}} \Big) - \sigma(\phi) \Big(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}} \Big) \right|^2 \right] \frac{1}{n} \to 0, \qquad \text{(C1)}
$$

$$
E \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor + 1} |\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}(\phi)|^4 \to 0, \qquad \text{(C2)}
$$

then Lemma C.1 yields existence of a Wiener process W such that $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{Y}^n(\phi))$ converges a.s. to $(A, B, \overline{Y}(\phi))$ as a sequence of processes whose paths belong to $\mathcal{D}(0, \infty; \mathbb{R}^3)$ with

$$
d\overline{Y}_t(\phi) = \sigma(\phi)(A_t) dW_t, \;\; t \in [0, \infty); \quad \overline{Y}_0 = 0. \qquad (20)
$$

ii) Condition (C1) can be verified easily. Hence, we concentrate on the condition (C2) (a special case of assumption (A4) of [23, Page 42]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{\mathcal{G}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}} \left[|\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi)|^4 \right] &\leq C(\Delta v^n)^2 (\Delta x^n)^4 E\left[\left| N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k}} - N^n_{\overline{\tau}^n_{a,k-1}} \right|^4 \right] \\
&\leq C \frac{1}{n^6} \left[n^4 + n \right] \\
&\leq C \frac{1}{n^2},
\end{aligned}
$$

where C is a positive constant which is independent of n and may vary from line to line. Thus, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$,

$$
E \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor + 1} |\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}(\phi)|^4 \leq C(nt + 1) \frac{1}{n^2} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.
$$

iii) We now show that the Brownian motion just obtained is unique if $\phi > 0$ (this assumption will be relaxed below). To this end, let us assume that there is other Wiener process $\tilde{W}$ that represents $\overline{Y}(\phi)$. Then, we have two representations of the resulting quadratic variation process:

$$
\langle \overline{Y}(\phi) \rangle_t = \int_0^t (\sigma(\phi)(A_s))^2\, ds = \int_0^t (\sigma(\phi)(A_s))^2\, d\langle W, \tilde{W} \rangle_s \quad \mathbb{P} \otimes dx\text{-a.s.}
$$

Since $\sigma(\phi) > 0$, because $\phi > 0$, this implies $\langle W, \tilde{W}\rangle_t = t\,\mathbb{P}\otimes dx$-a.s. In particular, $E[W_t\tilde{W}_t] = \frac{EW_t^2+E\tilde{W}_t^2}{2}$. Hence $E[(W_t - \tilde{W}_t)^2] = 0$ and thus $W = \tilde{W}$ almost surely.

iv) The previous arguments easily extend to the finite dimensional case. For each $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and any family of non-negative functions $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_l$, the processes $\overline{Y}^n(\phi_1), \dots, \overline{Y}^n(\phi_l)$) converges jointly to $(\overline{Y}(\phi_1), \dots, \overline{Y}(\phi_l))$ with probability 1, and each $\overline{Y}(\phi_i)$ admits a representation of the above form in terms of a Brownian motion. To show that all these Brownian motions coincide, we compute for $i, j = 1, \dots, l$,

$$E_{\mathcal{G}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}}\left[\left(\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi_j) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}(\phi_j)\right)\left(\overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k}{n}}(\phi_i) - \overline{Y}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}(\phi_i)\right)\right] = \frac{(\sigma^n(\phi_j+\phi_i))^2 - (\sigma^n(\phi_j-\phi_i))^2}{4n}\left(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n}\sigma^n(\phi_j)\sigma^n(\phi_i)\left(\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}\right).$$

This shows that the first column of the matrix $\bar{\sigma}(\cdot)$ in Lemma C.1 equals $(\sigma(\phi_1)(\cdot), \dots, \sigma(\phi_l)(\cdot))'$ while all the other entries of this matrix are zero. In particular, if one of the test function is strictly positive, the arguments given in step (iii) show that all the processes $\overline{Y}(\phi_i)$ are driven by the same Wiener process. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is dense in H^1, this completes the proof. □

The previous proposition characterizes the diffusion part of the limiting ask-side volume density process. Next we are going to study the limiting structures of aggregate order placements and cancellations, disregarding the random fluctuations. As we expect order placements and cancellations to contribute the drift part of the limiting model, we find it helpful to re-write their dynamics in the form of an integral in time. That is, if we write

$$\overline{V}^{n,2}_a(t,x) = \int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} g^n(s,x)ds,$$
$$\overline{V}^{n,1}_a(t,x) = \int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} \widetilde{g}^n(s,x)ds,$$

it is clear that we can identify the limiting drift term by studying the limits of g^n and $\widetilde{g}^n$. Comparing with (13), we have

$$g^n(t,x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_k)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}\right)}(x)\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n})}(t)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}n,$$
$$\widetilde{g}^n(t,x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_k)} \mathbf{1}_{\left(\pi^{\mathbf{P}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}\right)}(x)\omega^{\mathbf{P}}_i \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n})}(t)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}n.$$

With regards to aggregate cancellations, g^n only captures the proportionality of cancellations in terms of present volume. Therefore, we need to introduce another term $\overline{g}^n$ describing the actual cancellations, i.e.,

$$\overline{v}^n_a(t,x) - v_a(0,x) - \overline{V}^{n,1}_a(t,x) - \overline{V}^{n,3}_a(t,x) = \int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} \overline{g}^n(s,x)ds.$$

Clearly, $\overline{g}^n$ is given by

$$\overline{g}^n(t,x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_k)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k-1}{n}}\right)}(x)\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i v^n_a(\tau^n_{a,i-1},x)\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n})}(t)\frac{\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}n.$$

We will analyze the impact of order cancellations in the limit in two steps: first we show that we can replace $\overline{g}^n$ by the (much simpler) expression $g^n\overline{v}^n_a$ in the limit (see Lemma 3.12). Then we characterize the limit of the latter term in the appropriate sense (see Lemma 3.13, where we also characterize the limiting object of the order placements).

Remark 3.11. From Lemma 3.4, it follows that for $p \in \{2, 4\}$,

$$E\left[\left\|g^n(t)\right\|^p_{L^p}\right] + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\mathcal{F}^n_s} E\left[\left|g^n(t,x)\right|^p\right] \le C,$$

which implies that

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\int_0^t \left|g^n(s,x)\right|^p\, ds + E\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_0^t \left|g^n(s,x)\right|^p\, dsdx \le Ct,$$

with the constants C being independent of n and t.

Lemma 3.12. *For any $t > 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} \left|\overline{g}^n(s,x) - g^n(s,x)\overline{v}^n_a(s,x)\right|^2 dsdx\right] = 0. \tag{21}$$

Proof. Using Fubini's theorem and Remark 3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} \left|\overline{g}^n(s,x) - g^n(s,x)\overline{v}^n_a(s,x)\right|^2 dsdx\\
&= \int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} E\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Bigg|\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}^+}\sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_k)} \mathbf{1}_{I^n\left(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}_{\frac{k}{n}}\right)}(x)\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i\left(v^n_a(\tau^n_{a,i-1},x) - \overline{v}^n_a(s,x)\right)\mathbf{1}_{[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n})}(s)\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n n^{-1}}\Bigg|^2 dxds\\
&\le \int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}^+\cup\{0\}} \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{k}{n},\frac{k+1}{n})}(s)\left(E\int_{\mathbb{R}}|g^n(s,x)|^4dx\right)^{1/2}\left(E\sup_{i\in[N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1}),\,N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_k)]\cap\mathbb{N}^+}\|v^n_a(\tau_{a,i}) - v^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k-1})\|^4_{L^4}\right)^{1/2} ds\\
&\le C\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}}\left(E\int_{\mathbb{R}}|g^n(s,x)|^4dx\right)^{1/2} ds\\
&\le C\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left(E\int_0^{\frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}|g^n(s,x)|^4dx\right)^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

which by Remark 3.11 converges to zero as n tends to infinity. □

We can now analyze the limiting objects obtained from order placements and cancellations. The proof of Lemma 3.13 is technical and rather long and hence postponed to Appendix A.

Lemma 3.13. *For any $t = \frac{\lfloor nt\rfloor}{n}$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left[\left|\int_0^t \left(g^n(s,x) - E[\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_1]f^{\mathbf{C}}(A_s + x)\right)(1 - \alpha + \alpha\overline{v}^n_a(s,x))\, ds\right|^2\right] = 0, \quad \forall\,\alpha \in \{0,1\}, \tag{22}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left[\left|\int_0^t \left(\overline{g}^n(s,x) - E[\omega^{\mathbf{P}}_1]f^{\mathbf{P}}(A_s + x)\right) ds\right|^2\right] = 0. \tag{23}$$

Combining the characterization of the limit of the fluctuation part of $\overline{v}^n_{a/b}$ obtained in Proposition 3.10 with the characterization of the limits of order cancellations and placements obtained in Lemma 3.13 together with Lemma 3.12, we are in the position to characterize the limit of $\overline{v}^n$ itself.

Theorem 3.14. *There is a Wiener process* $\{W_a(t); t \in [0,\infty)\}$ *such that* $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}_a^{n,3}, \overline{v}_a^n) \Rightarrow (A, B, V_a^3, v_a)$, *with* (A, B) *the limit of* (A^n, B^n) *along a properly chosen sub-sequence,* V_a^3 *the limit obtained in Proposition 3.10 and*

$$v_a(t,x) = v_a(0,x) + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}}] f^{\mathbf{P}}(x + A_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s) v_a(s,x) \right) ds + \\ + \sqrt{2} \int_0^t E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}}\right] f^{\mathbf{N}}(x + A_s)\, dW_a(s), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Proof. The sequence of bid/ask prices is C-tight as a process taking values in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and converges to a limit (A, B) (along a subsequence). The processes $\overline{V}_a^{n,3}$ and $\overline{v}_a^n$ are tight taking values in H^{-1}, due to Proposition 3.8. Furthermore, $\overline{V}_a^{n,3}$ is C-tight, due to Proposition 3.10. Hence, the sequence $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}_a^{n,3}, \overline{v}_a^n)$ is tight with paths in $\mathcal{D}(0,\infty; \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1})$. We now identify the limit of $\overline{v}_a^n$ as a function of the (existing, yet still to be identified) limit of the price process.

In view of Skorohod's lemm we may assume that all processes are defined on a common probability space and that the sequence $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}_a^{n,3}, \overline{v}_a^n)$ converges to (A, B, V_a^3, v_a) w.p.1 (for some process v_a to be determined) along a subsequence as a sequence of processes whose sample paths lie in $\mathcal{D}(0,\infty; \mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1})$. In particular, this implies that $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{V}_a^{n,3}, \overline{v}_a^n)$ converges to (A, B, V_a^3, v_a) in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times H^{-1} \times H^{-1}$ for almost every (ω, t) along this subsequence.

To prove our convergence result, we analyze each term of the following additive decomposition separately:

$$\overline{v}_a^n(t,x) - v_a^n(0,x) = \overline{V}_a^{n,1}(t,x) + \widetilde{V}_a^{n,2}(t,x) + \overline{V}^{n,3}(t,x), \quad (t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{24}$$

where

$$\widetilde{V}_a^{n,2}(t,x) := \int_0^{\frac{[nt]}{n}} \overline{g}^n(s,x) ds.$$

Moreover, we restrict our processes to an interval $[0,T]$ with arbitrary fixed $T > 0$. Let us next show that v_a is actually a weak limit of the sequence $\overline{v}_a^n$ in the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R})$, where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ denotes the probability space obtained by Skorohod's lemm. The reason we work with $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ here is that below we want to test against functions in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, not just Schwartz functions, as the latter might not contain the density $f^{\mathbf{C}}$.

Let us now recall that the sequence of processes $\{\overline{v}_a^n\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R})$ by Lemma 3.6, and thus admits a weakly converging subsequence, say with a limit $\widetilde{v}_a$. By the Banach-Saks theorem, $\widetilde{v}_a$ is a strong limit in Cesaro sense of a subsequence (of the chosen subsequence) of $\overline{v}_a^n$ in $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}) \subset L^2\left(\Omega \times [0,T]; H^{-1}\right)$. Hence, its limit $\widetilde{v}_a$ must coincide with v_a, as a weak limit in $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R})$.

Due to Lemma 3.13, the process $\overline{V}_a^{n,1}(t)$ converges (along the selected subsequence) $\mathbb{P} \otimes dx$-a.e. to the process $\overline{V}^1$ defined by

$$\overline{V}^1(t) := E[\omega_a^{\mathbf{P}}] \int_0^t f_a^{\mathbf{P}}(\cdot + A_s) ds.$$

In view of (24), we may assume that $\widetilde{V}_a^{n,2}$ converges to some process K taking values in H^{-1} for almost all (ω, t). In view of the boundedness estimates of Lemma 3.6, combining Lemmas 3.12 and 3.13, we

are allowed to take K as the weak limit of $\widetilde{V}_a^{n,2}$ as well as of

$$\int_o^{\cdot} E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] f^{\mathbf{C}}(A_s + \cdot)\overline{v}_a^n(s,\cdot)\, ds$$

in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{F}_T \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}))$.

In order to identify the process K we test against test functions $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0,T], \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,T]))$ and $\phi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Weak convergence of $\overline{v}_a^n$ and $\widetilde{V}^{n,2}$ in the Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,T] \times \mathbb{R}))$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
E\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi(t)K(t,x)\phi(x)\, dx\, dt &= \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \psi(t)\langle \widetilde{V}_a^{n,2}(t),\, \phi\rangle\, dt \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \psi(t)\int_0^{\frac{[nt]}{n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \overline{g}^n(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx ds\, dt \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 3.12)} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \psi(t)\int_0^{\frac{[nt]}{n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g^n(s,x)\overline{v}_a^n(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx ds\, dt \\
&\quad \text{(by Lemma 3.13)} \\
&= E[\omega_{a,1}^{\mathbf{C}}] \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \psi(t)\int_0^{\frac{[nt]}{n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)\overline{v}_a^n(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx ds\, dt \\
&= E[\omega_{a,1}^{\mathbf{C}}] \lim_{n\to\infty} E\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)\overline{v}_a^n(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s}\Big[\int_s^T \psi(t)\, dt\Big] ds \\
&\quad \text{(by the weak covergence in Hilbert space)} \\
&= E[\omega_{a,1}^{\mathbf{C}}] E\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)v_a(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx E_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_s}\Big[\int_s^T \psi(t)\, dt\Big] ds \\
&= E[\omega_{a,1}^{\mathbf{C}}] E\int_0^T \psi(t)\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)v_a(s,x)\phi(x)\, dx ds\, dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\overline{\mathcal{F}}}_t$ denotes the filtration generated by all the processes $\bar{A}^n$, $\bar{B}^n$, A, B, $\overline{v}_a^n$ and v_a. Since $\phi \in L^2$ and $\psi \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0,T], \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0,T]))$ are arbitrary, we get

$$K(t,x) = E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] \int_0^t f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)v_a(s,x)\, ds$$

for almost every $(t,\omega,x) \in [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the limit v_a satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
v_a(t,x) = v_a(0,x) + \int_0^t \Big(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}}] f_a^{\mathbf{P}}(x + A_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s)v_a(s,x)\Big)\, ds + \\
+ \sqrt{2}\int_0^t E\left[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}}\right] f^{\mathbf{N}}(x + A_s)\, dW_a(s), \quad t \geq 0. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

3.3. **The limit of the volume density.** With tightness of the sequence of auxiliary processes $\overline{v}_{a/b}^n$ established in Proposition 3.8, we can now turn to the actual volume densities $v_{a/b}^n$. Recall that

$$\widehat{v}_{a/b}^n(u) = \overline{v}_{a/b}^n(\eta_u^n),$$

where $\widehat{v}^n_{a/b}$ is a piece-wise constant right-continuous process obtained by registering all order cancellations and placements at the next price-change, see (11), and η^n_u was defined in (12). Then Lemmas 2.11, B.5 and Theorem 3.14 implies that the limit of $(A^n, B^n, \widehat{v}^n_a)$ coincides with that of $(\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{v}^n_a)$, namely (A, B, v_a) of Theorem 3.14.

Let $\delta v^n_{a/b} := v^n_{a/b} - \widehat{v}^n_{a/b}$ and define analogously $\delta V^{n,i}_{a/b} := V^{n,i}_{a/b} - \widehat{V}^{n,i}_{a/b}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Below, we shall prove that $\delta v^n_{a/b}$ converges weakly to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Obviously, this implies (see Theorem 3.18 below) that if v^n_a converges then the limit must coincide with that of $\widehat{v}^n_a$ as well as of $\overline{v}^n_a$, namely v_a.

The first step for proving $\delta v^n_{a/b} \to 0$ is to establish bounds for second moments of the increments, in a similar way to Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6. In fact, analogous to Proposition 3.8 these estimates indicate the tightness of v^n_a and thus the tightness of (A^n, B^n, v^n_a). The rather technical proof is deferred to Appendix A.

Lemma 3.15. *It holds that*

$$E_{\mathcal{F}^n_s}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left\|V^{n,i}_{a/b}(t) - V^{n,i}_{a/b}(s)\right\|^2_{L^2}\right] \le C\left[(t-s) + (t-s)^2\right], \quad 0 \le s \le t < \infty,$$
$$E_{\mathcal{F}^n_s}\left[\left\|v^n_{a/b}(t) - v^n_{a/b}(s)\right\|^2_{L^2}\right] \le C^n_s\left[(t-s) + (t-s)^2\right], \quad 0 \le s \le t < \infty,$$

with $\sup_n E\left[\sup_{s\in[0,t]} C^n_s\right] \le C(t^2 + t)$, $t \in [0, \infty)$, *where the constants C are independent of n, s and t.*

Furthermore, we will show that $\delta v^n_{a/b}(t)$ converges point-wise to 0, for which we need some elementary results on Poisson processes.

Lemma 3.16. *Let N_1 and N_2 be two independent Poisson processes with intensities λ_1 and λ_2, respectively. Moreover, let T_i, $i = 1, \ldots$, denote the jump times of the Poisson process N_1. Then we have*

$$E\left[N_2(t) - N_2(T_{N_1(t)})\right] = \frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}\left(1 - e^{-\lambda_1 t}\right),$$
$$E\left[\left(N_2(t) - N_2(T_{N_1(t)})\right)\left(N_2(t) - N_2(T_{N_1(t)}) - 1\right)\right] = 4\frac{\lambda_2^2}{\lambda_1^2}\left(1 - (1 + t\lambda_1)e^{-\lambda_1 t}\right).$$

Proof. Notice that conditional on $N_1(t) = l$, the relative difference $(t - T_l)/t$ has a beta distribution with parameters 1 and l, as this is the distribution of the differences in the order statistics of l random variables distributed uniformly on $[0, 1]$. Hence, elementary calculations give

$$E\left[N_2(t) - N_2(T_l) \,|\, N_1(t) = l\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k \int_0^1 e^{-\lambda_2 t x}\frac{(\lambda_2 t x)^k}{k!}\frac{1-x)^{l-1}}{B(1,l)}dx = \frac{\lambda_2 t}{1+l}$$

and

$$E\left[\left(N_2(t) - N_2(T_l)\right)\left(N_2(t) - N_2(T_l) - 1\right) \,|\, N_1(t) = l\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} k(k-1) \int_0^1 e^{-\lambda_2 t x}\frac{(\lambda_2 t x)^k}{k!}\frac{1-x)^{l-1}}{B(1,l)}dx$$
$$= \frac{2\lambda_2^2 t^2}{2 + 3l + l^2}.$$

Multiplying these terms with $P(N_1(t) = l) = e^{-\lambda_1 t}\frac{(\lambda_1 t)^l}{l!}$ and summing over l gives the formulas from above. □

Lemma 3.17. *Let $u = u(t) = u(t,x)$ denote any of the processes $\delta v^n_{a/b}$, $\delta V^{n,i}_{a/b}$, $i = 1,2,3$. Moreover, assume that the sequence $v^n_{a/b}(0)$ is uniformly bounded in L^2. Then there is a constant C independent of n or t such that*

$$E\left[\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2}\right] \leq C(1+t+t^2)/n, \quad \forall\, t \in [0,\infty).$$

Proof. Let us first consider $u = \delta V^{n,i}_{a/b}$ for some $i = 1,2,3$ and a or b. Note that for some random variables ω_i and π_i we have for some scaling constant ϵ (either equal to $\Delta v/\Delta x$ or equal to $\sqrt{\Delta v}$)

$$u(t,x)^2 = \left(\sum_{i=N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)}^{N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\omega_i\right)^2 \epsilon^2,$$

as $\widetilde{\xi}_{a/b,i}$ is constant in i and $\widetilde{\xi}^2_{a/b,i} = 1$. Letting $\mathcal{G}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by all sources of randomness *except* $(\omega_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[u(t,x)^2\right] &= E\left[\left\{\sum_{i\neq i'=N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)}^{N(t)} E_{\mathcal{G}}\left[\omega_i\omega_{i'}\right]\mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_{i'}\right)}(x) + \sum_{i=N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)}^{N(t)} E_{\mathcal{G}}\left[\omega_i^2\right]\mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\right\}\right]\epsilon^2 \\ &= E\left[\left\{\sum_{i\neq i'=N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)}^{N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_i\right)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_{i'}\right)}(x)E[\omega_1]^2 + \sum_{i=N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)}^{N(t)} \mathbf{1}_{I\left(A^n(\widetilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+\pi_i\right)}(x)E\left[\omega_1^2\right]\right\}\right]\epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, conditioning on the σ-algebra generated by all sources of randomness except for $(\pi_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$, we can bound in a similar way to (14)

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[u(t,x)^2\right] \leq E\Bigg[&E\left[\omega_1\right]^2\|f\|^2_\infty\,\Delta x^2\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)\right)\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)-1\right)\mathbf{1}_{\left[A(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)})-M,A(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+M\right]}(x)+ \\ &+ E\left[\omega_1^2\right]\|f\|^2_\infty\,\Delta x\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\left[A(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)})-M,A(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)})+M\right]}(x)\Bigg]\epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, plugging in Lemma 3.16, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E\left[\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2}\right] &\leq C\left(\Delta x^2 E\left[\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)\right)\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)-1\right)\right] + \Delta x E\left[\left(N(t)-N\left(\widetilde{\tau}_{\widetilde{N}(t)}\right)\right)\right]\right)\epsilon^2 \\ &= C\left(\Delta x^2 4\frac{\lambda^2}{\mu^2}\left[1-(1+t\mu)e^{-\mu t}\right] + \Delta x\frac{\lambda}{\mu}\left[1-e^{-\mu t}\right]\right)\epsilon^2 \\ &\leq C\left(\frac{1}{n}\frac{n^4}{n^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\frac{n^2}{n}\right)\epsilon^2 \\ &= C\left(n+\sqrt{n}\right)\epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall that $\epsilon^2 = \frac{\Delta v^2}{\Delta x^2} = n^{-3}$ in case $i = 1,2$ and $\epsilon^2 = \Delta v = n^{-2}$ in case $i = 3$.

The proof for the estimate of $\delta v^n_{a/b}$ works in precisely the same way as the proof of Lemma 3.6, taking into account the appropriate estimates for $\delta V^{n,i}_{a/b}$ derived above. □

Combining these lemmas with the results in Theorem 3.14 we can now prove convergence of the volume densities. We denote by (A,B) an accumulation point of the sequence of price processes. Ex post, we shall see that the limit is unique, and hence we do not actually need to work with such a sub-sequence.

Theorem 3.18. *There are two independent Wiener processes $\{W_a(t); t \in [0,T]\}$ and $\{W_b(t); t \in [0,T]\}$ such that $(A^n, B^n, v_a^n, v_b^n) \Rightarrow (A, B, v_a, v_b)$ (at least along a sub-sequence) the volume processes v_a and v_b satisfying the infinite-dimensional SDE*

$$
\begin{aligned}
v_b(t,\cdot) =& v_{b,0}(\cdot) + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_b}] f^{\mathbf{P}_b}(\cdot + B_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_b}] f^{\mathbf{C}_b}(\cdot + B_s) v_b(s,\cdot) \right) ds \\
&+ \sqrt{2} E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_b}] \int_0^t f^{\mathbf{N}_b}(\cdot + B_s)\, dW_b(s), \quad t \geq 0; \\
v_a(t,\cdot) =& v_{a,0}(\cdot) + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a}] f^{\mathbf{P}_a}(\cdot + A_s) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_a}] f^{\mathbf{C}_a}(\cdot + A_s) v_a(s,\cdot) \right) ds \\
&+ \sqrt{2} E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_a}] \int_0^t f^{\mathbf{N}_a}(\cdot + A_s)\, dW_a(s), \quad t \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}
$$

Proof. Recall that

$$(A^n, B^n, \widehat{v}_a^n)(u) = (\bar{A}^n, \bar{B}^n, \overline{v}_a^n)(\eta_u^n).$$

Combining Lemmas 2.11, B.5 and Theorem 3.14, we conclude that $(A^n, B^n, \widehat{v}_a^n) \Rightarrow (A, B, v_a)$. On the other hand, in a similar way to Proposition 3.8 we derive from Lemma 3.15 the tightness of (A^n, B^n, v_a^n). Additionally, Lemma 3.17 indicates that the limit of (A^n, B^n, v_a^n) coincides with that of $(A^n, B^n, \widehat{v}_a^n)$, namely (A, B, v_a). This implies the C-tightness of (A^n, B^n, v_a^n) and thus the tightness of (A^n, B^n, v_a^n, v_b^n) by Corollary B.4. Furthermore, in a similar way to the ask side we verify that $(A^n, B^n, v_a^n, v_b^n) \Rightarrow (A, B, v_a, v_b)$. □

4. Characterization of the limit price process

So far, we have shown that the sequence (B^n, A^n, v_a^n, v_b^n) is C-tight and hence that $(B^n, A^n, v_a^n, v_b^n, Y^{a,n}, Y^{b,n})$ is tight. As a result, any accumulation point $(Y^{b/a})$ of $(Y^{b/a,n})$ is of the form:

$$Y_t^a = \langle v_a(t,\cdot),\, \varphi^a(\cdot + A_t) \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad Y_t^b = \langle v_b(t,\cdot),\, \varphi^b(\cdot + B_t) \rangle \tag{26}$$

where (A, B) is a weak accumulation point of the sequence of price processes. To show that this accumulation point is unique and to characterize its dynamics notice that

$$\bar{B}_t^n = B_0^n + \Delta x^n \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \xi_{b,i}^n = B_0^n + \int_0^t b_b(\bar{B}_s^n, \bar{A}_s^n, \bar{Y}_s^{b,n}, \bar{Y}_s^{a,n})\, ds + \Delta x^n \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left(\xi_{b,i}^n - E_{\mathscr{F}_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^n} \xi_{b,i}^n \right) + R_b^n(t),$$

with

$$R_b^n(t) := \int_0^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} b_b^n(\bar{B}_{s-}^n, \bar{A}_{s-}^n, \bar{Y}_{s-}^{b,n}, \bar{Y}_{s-}^{a,n})\, ds - \int_0^t b_b(\bar{B}_s^n, \bar{A}_s^n, \bar{Y}_s^{b,n}, \bar{Y}_s^{a,n})\, ds.$$

In view of Assumption 2, $\lim_{n\to\infty} E|R_b^n(t)|^2 = 0$ for any $t > 0$. Similar arguments apply to $\bar{A}^n$. In view of Lemma C.1 we therefore conclude that there exist a two dimensional Wiener process $\tilde{W}$ such that

$$\Delta x^n \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left(\xi_{b/a,i}^n - E_{\mathscr{F}_{\frac{i-1}{n}}^n} \xi_{b/a,i}^n \right) \quad \text{converges in probability to} \quad \int_0^t \sigma_{b/a}(B_s, A_s, Y_s^b, Y_s^a)\, d\tilde{W}(s),$$

We conclude that the limit (A, B) must be of the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_t =& A_0 + \int_0^t b_a(B_s, A_s, Y_s^b, Y_s^a)\, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_a(B_s, A_s, Y_s^b, Y_s^a)\, d\tilde{W}(s) \\
B_t =& B_0 + \int_0^t b_b(B_s, A_s, Y_s^b, Y_s^a)\, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_b(B_s, A_s, Y_s^b, Y_s^a)\, d\tilde{W}(s), \quad t \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}
$$

Here, in view of the proof for Proposition 3.10, we conclude from Lemma C.1 that the Wiener processes $\tilde{W}$, W_a and W_b are independent, due to the independence assumptions on $(\widetilde{\xi}_{b/a,i})_{i\in\mathbb{N}^+}$. Standard results on infinite-dimensional stochastic equations [8] guarantee that the coupled system (25) and (27) admits a unique adapted solution $(B, A, Y^b, Y^a, v_a, v_b)$ in $L^2(\Omega; C([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^4 \times (L^2)^2))$ for any $T > 0$. This shows that

$$
(B^n, A^n, Y^{b,n}, Y^{a,n}, v_a^n, v_b^n) \Rightarrow (B, A, Y^b, Y^a, v_a, v_b).
$$

Remark 4.1. It follows from the preceding analysis that the "volume at the top of the book" follows a 2-dimensional Brownian motion with drift:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y_t^b =& \langle v_{b,0}(\cdot), \varphi\rangle + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_b}] \langle f^{\mathbf{P}_b}, \varphi\rangle + f_s^b \right) ds \\
&+ \sqrt{2} E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_b}] \int_0^t \langle f^{\mathbf{N}_b}, \varphi\rangle\, dW_b(s) + \int_0^t \langle v_b(s,\cdot),\, D\varphi(\cdot + B_s)\sigma_b(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)\, d\tilde{W}(s)\rangle, \quad t \geq 0 \\
Y_t^a =& \langle v_{a,0}(\cdot), \psi\rangle + \int_0^t \left(E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a}] \langle f^{\mathbf{P}_a}, \psi\rangle + f_s^a \right) ds \\
&+ \sqrt{2} E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{N}_a}] \int_0^t \langle f^{\mathbf{N}_a}, \psi\rangle\, dW_a(s) + \int_0^t \langle v_a(s,\cdot),\, D\psi(\cdot + B_s)\sigma_a(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a)\, d\tilde{W}(s)\rangle, \quad t \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_t^a =& \left\langle v_a(t,\cdot),\, \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\left\{\sigma_a\sigma_a'(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D^2\psi(A_t + \cdot)\right\} + b_a(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D\psi(A_t + \cdot) \right\rangle \\
&- E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_a}] \left\langle f^{\mathbf{C}_a}(\cdot) v_a(t,\cdot),\, \psi \right\rangle, \\
f_t^b =& \left\langle v_b(t,\cdot),\, \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\left\{\sigma_b\sigma_b'(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D^2\varphi(A_t + \cdot)\right\} + b_b(B_t, A_t, Y_t^b, Y_t^a) D\varphi(B_t + \cdot) \right\rangle \\
&- E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}_b}] \left\langle f^{\mathbf{C}_b}(\cdot) v_b(t,\cdot),\, \varphi \right\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

Appendix A. Technical proofs

Proof of Lemma 3.13. We prove (22); the second assertion follows similarly. Without any loss of generality, we assume $E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] = 1$. For each $s \in (\frac{1}{n}, t)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we choose $k_s^n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $s \in [\frac{k_s^n+1}{n}, \frac{k_s^n+2}{n})$. For $s \in (0, \frac{1}{n})$, put $k_s^n = 0$. For notational simplicity, we set $\tilde{v}_a^n(s,x) = 1 - \alpha + \alpha\overline{v}_a^n(s,x)$, with $\alpha \in \{1, 0\}$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left| \int_0^t \left(g^n(s,x) - E[\omega_1^{\mathbf{C}}] f^{\mathbf{C}}(A_s + x) \right) \tilde{v}_a^n(s,x)\, ds \right|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left| \int_0^t \left(f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k_s^n}{n}}) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + A_s) \right) \tilde{v}_a^n(s,x)\, ds \right|^2 + 2 \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left| \int_0^t \left(g^n(s,x) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k_s^n}{n}}) \right) \tilde{v}_a^n(s,x) ds \right|^2 \\
&:= 2(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2).
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $f^{\mathbf{C}}$ is Lipschitz continuous and vanishes outside a compact interval there exists a constant $C < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1 &= \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \left(f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}}) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+A_s)\right)\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\ &\leq C\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\int_0^t |\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)|^2 ds\, E\int_0^t |A_s - \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}}|^2 \wedge 1\, ds.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.6, $\Gamma_1 \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ by dominated convergence, due to the a.s. continuity A. Using independence of cancellation price levels and volumes, a direct computation yields:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_2 &= \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \left(g^n(s,x) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\right)\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\ &= \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \left(\sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s+1})}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i \mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(x)\frac{\Delta v^n n}{\Delta x^n} - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\right)\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\ &\leq 3\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s+1})}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \Big(\mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i - \int_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})} f^{\mathbf{C}}(y+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\,dy\Big)\mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(x)\frac{\Delta v^n \tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)n}{\Delta x^n}ds\right|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \sum_{i=N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s})+1}^{N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s+1})}\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{1}{\Delta x^n}\int_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})} f^{\mathbf{C}}(y+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\,dy\mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(x) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\right)n\Delta v^n\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)ds\right|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \left(\left(N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s+1}) - N^n_a(\overline{\tau}^n_{k^n_s})\right)n\Delta v^n - 1\right) f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\ &:= 3\Big(\gamma_0+\gamma_1+\gamma_2\Big).\end{aligned}$$

To estimate γ_0 we use again independence of involved random variables, the fact that

$$E_{\mathcal{F}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}}}\left[\mathbf{1}_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}(\pi^{\mathbf{C}}_i + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\omega^{\mathbf{C}}_i\right] = \int_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})} f^{\mathbf{C}}(y+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\,dy$$

along with Lemmas 3.3 and 3.6 and the properties of the scaling constants to conclude that:

$$\gamma_0 \leq Ct^2 \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}|\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)|^2 \frac{\lambda^n}{\mu^n}\Big(\frac{n\Delta v^n}{\Delta x^n}\Big)^2 \|f^{\mathbf{C}}\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x^n \leq Ct^2\left(t^2+t+1\right)\Delta x^n \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n\to\infty.$$

To estimate γ_1 we first deduce from Lipschitz continuity of $f^{\mathbf{C}}$ for $x\in[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})$ that

$$\frac{1}{\Delta x^n}\int_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}\left|f^{\mathbf{C}}(y+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}}) - f^{\mathbf{C}}(x+\bar{A}^n_{\frac{k^n_s}{n}})\right|dy \leq L\frac{1}{\Delta x^n}\int_{[x^n_j,x^n_{j+1})}|\Delta x^n|\,dy = L\Delta x^n.$$

Thus, using again Lemmas 3.3 and 3.6, the properties of the scaling constants and the fact that $f^{\mathbf{C}}$ vanishes outside a compact interval we find a constant $C<\infty$ such that:

$$\gamma_1 \leq Ct^2 n^{-1}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}|\tilde{v}^n_a(s,x)|^2 \leq Ct^2\left(t^2+t+1\right)n^{-1}\longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n\to\infty.$$

In view of Lemma 3.3, boundedness of $f^{\mathbf{C}}$ and independence of involved random variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_2 &= \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^t \left(\left(N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{k_s^n+1}) - N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{k_s^n})\right) n\Delta\nu^n - 1\right) f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{k_s^n}{n}})\tilde{v}_a^n(s,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\
&\le 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor}\left(\left(N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_l) - N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{l-1})\right) n\Delta\nu^n - 1\right) f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{l-1}{n}})\tilde{v}_a^n(\frac{l-1}{n},x)\frac{1}{n}\right|^2 \\
&\quad + 2\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\left|\int_0^{\frac{1}{n}} f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}_0^n)\tilde{v}_a^n(0,x)\,ds\right|^2 \\
&\le 2(\Delta\nu^n)^2 E\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor nt\rfloor}\left|\left(N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_l) - N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{l-1}) - E[N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_l) - N_a^n(\overline{\tau}^n_{l-1})]\right) f^{\mathbf{C}}(x + \bar{A}^n_{\frac{l-1}{n}})\tilde{v}_a^n(\frac{l-1}{n},x)\right|^2 + C/n \\
&\le \frac{C}{n}\left(1 + t\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}|\tilde{v}_a^n(s,x)|^2\right) \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.15. Without any loss of generality, we take $s = 0$ and prove the assertions for the ask side. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left\|V_a^{n,1}(t)\right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}\right)^2\int_{\mathbb{R}} E\left|\sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(t)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a})\right|^2 dx \\
&= \left(\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}\right)^2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\lambda^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\lambda^n t}E_{N_a^n(t)=l}\Bigg[\sum_{i>i';i,i'=1}^{l} \\
&2\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a})\right)\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\omega_{i'}^{\mathbf{P}_a}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i'})}) + \pi_{i'}^{\mathbf{P}_a})\right) \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^{l}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} E|\omega_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}|^2\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(x)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}) + \pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a})\Bigg] dx \\
&\le C\left(\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}\right)^2\int_{\mathbb{R}}\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\lambda^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\lambda^n t}E_{N_a^n(t)=l}\Bigg[\sum_{i<i';i,i'=1}^{l} 2(E\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a})^2\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}),M+A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})})]}(x)\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}^2(\Delta x^n)^2 \\
&+ E|\omega_1^{\mathbf{P}_a}|^2\sum_{i=1}^{l}\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}),M+A^n(\tilde{\tau}^n_{\widetilde{N}^n(\tau^n_{a,i})}))}(x)\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x^n\Bigg] dx \\
&\le C\left(\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}\right)^2\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\frac{(\lambda^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\lambda^n t}\left[l(l-1)\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}^2(\Delta x^n)^2 + l\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x^n\right] \\
&\le C\left(\frac{\Delta\nu^n}{\Delta x^n}\right)^2\left[(\lambda^n t\Delta x^n)^2 + \lambda^n t\Delta x^n\right] \\
&\le C(t^2 + t),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we have $E\left\|V_a^{n,2}(t)\right\|_{L^2}^2 \le C(t^2+t)$, where the constants Cs are independent of n. Taking the supremum norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty}$ instead, we obtain

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\mathcal{F}_s^n}|V_a^{n,1}(t)-V_a^{n,1}(s)|^2 + \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} E_{\mathcal{F}_s^n}|V_a^{n,2}(t)-V_a^{n,2}(s)|^2 \le C[t-s+(t-s)^2], \quad 0\le s\le t<\infty.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\|V_a^{n,3}(s)\|_{L^2}^2\\
&= E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{N_a^n(s)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{\widetilde N^n(\tau^n_{a,i})})+\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a})\widetilde\xi_{a,\widetilde N^n(\tau^n_{a,i})+1}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}\right\|_{L^2}^2\\
&= E\sup_{s\in[0,t]}\left\|\sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde N^n(s)}\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1})+1}^{N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\widetilde\xi_{a,k}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}\right.\\
&\quad\left.+\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{\widetilde N^n(s)})+1}^{N_a^n(s)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{\widetilde N^n(s)}))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\widetilde\xi_{a,\widetilde N^n(s)+1}\sqrt{\Delta v^n}\right\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\le C\Delta v^n E\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde N^n(t)}\left\|\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1})+1}^{N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\right\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+\left\|\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{\widetilde N^n(t)})+1}^{N_a^n(t)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{\widetilde N^n(t)}))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\right\|_{L^2}^2\Bigg]\\
&= C\Delta v^n\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\mu^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\mu^n t}E_{\widetilde N^n(t)=l}\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{l}\left\|\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1})+1}^{N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\cdot)\right\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+\left\|\sum_{i=N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_l)+1}^{N_a^n(t)}\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}(\pi_i^{\mathbf{P}_a}+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l))\mathbf{1}_{[x_j^n,x_{j+1}^n)}\right\|_{L^2}^2\Bigg]\\
&\le C\Delta v^n\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\mu^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\mu^n t}E_{\widetilde N^n(t)=l}\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{l}(N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))(N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1})-1)\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}^2\\
&\qquad(\Delta x^n)^2\|\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l),M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l))}\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+\sum_{k=1}^{l}(N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x^n\|\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l),M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l)]}\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_l))(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_l)-1)\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}^2(\Delta x^n)^2\|\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l),M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l)]}\|_{L^2}^2\\
&\quad+(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_l))\|f^{\mathbf{P}_a}\|_{L^\infty}\Delta x^n\|\mathbf{1}_{[-M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l),M+A^n(\tilde\tau^n_l)]}\|_{L^2}^2\Bigg]\\
&\le C\Delta v^n\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\mu^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\mu^n t}E_{\widetilde N^n(t)=l}\Bigg[\sum_{k=1}^{l}(N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1}))(N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_k)-N_a^n(\tilde\tau^n_{k-1})-1)\,(\Delta x^n)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{k=1}^{l}(N_a^n(\tilde{\tau}_k^n)-N_a^n(\tilde{\tau}_{k-1}^n))+(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde{\tau}_l^n))(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde{\tau}_l^n)-1)(\Delta x^n)^2+(N_a^n(t)-N_a^n(\tilde{\tau}_l^n))\Big]\\
&=C\Delta v^n\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\mu^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\mu^n t}E\Big[\\
&\quad lN_a^n(\beta(1,l))(N_a^n(\beta(1,l))-1)\,(\Delta x^n)^2+lN_a^n(\beta(1,l))+N_a^n(\beta(1,l))(\Delta x^n)^2+N_a^n(\beta(1,l))\Big]\\
&=C\Delta v^n\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}\frac{(\mu^n t)^l}{l!}e^{-\mu^n t}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\Big[lm(m-1)(\Delta x^n)^2+m^2(\Delta x^n)^2+(l+1)m\Big]\int_0^1\frac{(\lambda^n tz)^m}{m!}e^{-\lambda^n tz}\frac{(1-z)^{l-1}}{B(1,l)}dz\\
&\le Ct\Delta v^n\left[\frac{(\lambda^n\Delta x^n)^2}{\mu^n}+\lambda^n\right]\\
&\le Ct,
\end{aligned}
$$

with the constant C independent of n and t.

The estimate of $v_{a/b}^n$ follows precisely in the same way as the proof of Lemma 3.6, taking into account the appropriate estimates for $V_{a/b}^{n,i}$ derived above. □

Appendix B. Classical tightness results

For the convenience of the reader, we recall some classical results on tightness which the derivations of Section 3 are based on. We first note that though the following theorems and lemmas may be originally established on finite time intervals, we state them on the half line $[0,\infty)$ since there is no essential difficulty to make such extensions in the spirit of Jacod and Shiryaev [19].

The first result is a sufficient condition for tightness in the Skorokhod space $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty);E)$ for a complete separable metric state space (E,ρ) due to Aldous and Kurtz. We take it from [26, Th. 6.8].

Theorem B.1. *Let X_n be a sequence of processes taking values in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty);E)$ such that the family $(X_n(t))_{n\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ of random variables is tight (in E) for any rational t. Moreover, assume that there is a number $p>0$ and processes $(\gamma_n(\delta))_{\delta\in[0,\infty)}$, $n\in\mathbb{N}^+$, such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left[\rho\left(X_n(t+\delta),X_n(t)\right)^p\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_t^n\right]&\le E\left[\gamma_n(\delta)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_t^n\right],\\
\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}E\left[\gamma_n(\delta)\right]&=0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the filtration $\mathcal{F}^n$ is generated by X^n. Then $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ is tight in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty);E)$.

Proof. See [26, Th. 6.8]. Note that Walsh assumes one joint filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$, whereas we allow for filtrations depending on n. This difference is, however, inconsequential, e.g., by choosing X^n to be defined on a common probability space in an independent way and then choosing $\mathcal{F}_t$ to be the filtration generated by all the filtrations $\mathcal{F}_t^n$. □

The following lemma on C-tightness is borrowed from [19, Proposition 3.26, Page 351].

Lemma B.2. *For a sequence X^n with paths in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty);\mathbb{R}^d)$ ($d\in\mathbb{N}^+$), it is C-tight if and only if it is tight and for all $N\in\mathbb{N}^+$, $\epsilon>0$, there holds*

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}^n\left(\sup_{t\le N}|\Delta X_t^n|>\epsilon\right)=0.
$$

The main theoretical tool in this paper is Mitoma's theorem, on basis of [26, Th. 6.13, Lem. 6.14, Note on p. 365], which relates tightness of distribution-valued processes to real-valued processes obtained by applying test-functions. We specialize the general formulation given in [26] so that the theorem can be directly applied to our setting.

Theorem B.3 (Mitoma's theorem)**.** *For any positive integer d, let $X^n := (X_1^n, \cdots, X_d^n)$ be a sequence of processes with sample paths lying in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^d\right)$. The sequence X^n is tight as processes with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^d\right)$, if and only if for any $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_d \in \mathcal{E}$ we have tightness of the sequence of $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty); \mathbb{R})$-valued processes $\sum_{i=1}^d \left\langle X_i^n, \phi_i \right\rangle$. In particular, if for any $\epsilon, N \in (0,\infty)$ there exists $\widetilde{N} \in (0,\infty)$ such that $\sup_n \mathbb{P}(\sup_{t\in[0,N]} \sum_{i=1}^d \|X_i^n(t)\|_{L^2} > \widetilde{N}) < \epsilon$, then X^n is tight as a sequence of processes with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); \left(H^{-1}\right)^d\right)$.*

Here we choose H^{-1} for convenience. Indeed, in view of the arguments in [26, Page 335, Example 1a], we can replace the space H^{-1} by H^{-m} for any $m > 1/2$. On the other hand, an immediate application of Theorem B.3 is the following corollary, which states that joint tightness of a pair of sequences of stochastic processes follows from individual tightness assuming that at least one of the involved sequences is C-tight, i.e., all its accumulation points are continuous processes.

Corollary B.4. *Let Y^n and Z^n be sequences of stochastic processes taking values in $(\mathcal{E}')^d$ and $(\mathcal{E}')^l$ respectively, with $d, l \in \mathbb{N}^+$. If Y^n is C-tight with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^d\right)$ and Z^n is tight with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^l\right)$, then the pair of processes (Y^n, Z^n) is tight with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^{d+l}\right)$.*

Proof. We fist note that for the finite-dimensional case where $(\mathcal{E}')^d$ and $(\mathcal{E}')^l$ are replaced by Euclidean spaces, Corollary B.4 coincides with [19, Cor. VI.3.33]. Obviously the C-tightness of Y^n with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^d\right)$ implies that of $\sum_{i=1}^d \langle Y_i^n, \phi_i \rangle$ with paths in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty); \mathbb{R})$ for any $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_d \in \mathcal{E}$. As Theorem B.3 allows us to prove the tightness of distribution-valued processes by verifying that of the real-valued processes obtained by applying test-functions, there follows the tightness of pair of processes (Y^n, Z^n) with paths in $\mathcal{D}\left([0,\infty); (\mathcal{E}')^{d+l}\right)$. □

We remark that the method of proof for the finite-dimensional case (see [19, Page 353, Cor. VI.3.33]) can not directly be applied to Corollary B.4, as the compactness of the unit ball is key to their proof of the finite-dimensional case. On the other hand, if we replace $(\mathcal{E}')^d$ for Y^n by $\mathbb{R}^m \times (\mathcal{E}')^d$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}^+$, then Corollary B.4 still holds, since the finite-dimensional space is isomorphic as well as homeomorphic to some subspace of $\mathcal{E}'$.

We also use a lemma of Billingsley about weak limits under time-changes.

Lemma B.5. *Let X^n be a sequence of processes taking values in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty); E)$ for some separable metric space E and let Φ^n be a sequence of non-decreasing processes with paths in $\mathcal{D}([0,\infty); [0,\infty))$. Assume that (X^n, Φ^n) converge weakly to a pair of processes $(X, \Phi) \in \mathcal{D}([0,\infty); E \times [0,\infty))$ such that $X \in C([0,\infty); E)$ with probability 1. Then*

$$X^n \circ \Phi^n \Rightarrow X \circ \Phi.$$

Proof. The proof in Billingsley [3, p. 151] (for the special case $E = \mathbb{R}$) can be immediately adapted to this more general setting. □

Appendix C. A result on the characterization of stochastic process limits

We close the appendix with a lemma on the characterization of almost sure limits of stochastic processes. The lemma can be seen as a corollary of [23, Theorem 1]. Its proof follows exactly as in [23, Theorem 1, Page 44–48] and is hence omitted.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let $\{\delta Z_k^n\}$ be an orthogonal sequence of $\mathbb{R}^m$-valued ($m \in \mathbb{N}^+$) mean-zero random variables, and define

$$Z_u^n = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nu \rfloor} \delta Z_k^n, \quad u \in [0.\infty).$$

Let X^n be an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued process ($d \in \mathbb{N}^+$) which is piecewise constant on the grid defined by $\{\frac{k}{n}\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}^+}$. Let $\{\mathcal{B}_t^n\}_{t\geq 0}$ be the filtration generated by X^n and Z^n and assume that

$$E_{\mathcal{B}_{\frac{k}{n}}^n}\left[\delta Z_k^n (\delta Z_k^n)'\right] = \frac{1}{n}\bar{\sigma}_n \bar{\sigma}_n'\left(X_{\frac{k}{n}}, \frac{k}{n}\right),$$

where the sequence of functions $\bar{\sigma}_n : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$ are uniformly bounded.

Lemma C.1. *Assume there exist some $\alpha > 0$ and bounded and continuous $\mathbb{R}^{m\times m}$-valued function $\bar{\sigma}$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0,\infty)$ such that the following conditions hold:*

(C1) for each $t > 0$,

$$\frac{1}{n} E \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} \left| \bar{\sigma}_n\left(X_{\frac{k}{n}}^n, \frac{k}{n}\right) - \bar{\sigma}\left(X_{\frac{k}{n}}^n, \frac{k}{n}\right)\right|^2 \to 0, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty;$$

(C2) for each $t > 0$,

$$E \sum_{k}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} |\delta Z_k^n|^{2+\alpha} \to \infty, \quad \text{as } n \to \infty.$$

Then, if (X^n, Z^n) converges to (X, Z) with probability 1 in $D = \mathcal{D}([0,\infty); \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m)$, there exists an m-dimensional Wiener process W, such that (X, Z) is non-anticipative with respect to W and such that

$$Z_t = \int_0^t \bar{\sigma}(X_s, s)\, dW_s, \quad t \in [0,\infty).$$

References

[1] Erhan Bayraktar, Ulrich Horst, and Ronnie Sircar. Queuing theoretic approaches to financial price fluctuations. *Handb. Oper. Res. Manag. Sci.*, 15:637–677, 2007.

[2] Bruno Biais, Pierre Hillion, and Chester Spatt. An empirical analysis of the limit order book and the order flow in the Paris bourse. *J. Financ.*, 50(5):1655–1689, 1995.

[3] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.

[4] Gökhan Cebiroglu and Ulrich Horst. Optimal order display in limit order markets with liquidity competition. Preprint, 2015.

[5] Rama Cont and Adrien De Larrard. Order book dynamics in liquid markets: Limit theorems and diffusion approximations. *Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1757861*, 2012.

[6] Rama Cont and Adrien De Larrard. Price dynamics in a Markovian limit order market. *SIAM J. Financ. Math.*, 4(1):1–25, 2013.

[7] Rama Cont, Sasha Stoikov, and Rishi Talreja. A stochastic model for order book dynamics. *Oper. Res.*, 58(3):549–563, 2010.

[8] Guiseppe Da Prato and Jerzy Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
[9] Darrell Duffie and Philip Protter. From discrete-to continuous-time finance: Weak convergence of the financial gain process. *Math. Financ.*, 2(1):1–15, 1992.
[10] David Easley and Maureen O'Hara. Price, trade size, and information in securities markets. *J. Financ. Econ.*, 19(1):69–90, 1987.
[11] Hans Föllmer and Martin Schweizer. A microeconomic approach to diffusion models for stock prices. *Math. Financ.*, 3(1):1–23, 1993.
[12] Mark B Garman. Market microstructure. *J. Financ. Econ.*, 3(3):257–275, 1976.
[13] Lawrence R. Glosten and Paul R. Milgrom. Bid, ask and transaction prices in a specialist market with heterogeneously informed traders. *J. Financ. Econ.*, 14(1):71–100, 1985.
[14] Xuefeng Gao, J.G. Dai, A.B. Dieker and S.J. Deng. Hydrodynamic limit of order book dynamics. Preprint, 2014.
[15] Nikolaus Hautsch and Ruihong Huang. The market impact of a limit order. *J. Econ. Dyn. Control*, 36:501–522, 2012.
[16] Ulrich Horst and Dörte Kreher. A weak law of large numbers for a limit order book model with fully state dependent order dynamics. Preprint, 2015.
[17] Ulrich Horst and Michael Paulsen. A law of large numbers for limit order books. Preprint, 2013.
[18] Ulrich Horst and Christian Rothe. Queuing, social interactions, and the microstructure of financial markets. *Macroecon. Dyn.*, 12(02):211–233, 2008.
[19] Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, volume 288 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003.
[20] Weining Kang and Ruth J. Williams. An invariance principle for semimartingale reflecting Brownian motions in domains with piecewise smooth boundaries. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 17(2):741–779, 2007.
[21] Lukasz Kruk. Functional limit theorems for a simple auction. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 28(4):716–751, 2003.
[22] Thomas Kurtz. Strong a proximation theorems for density dependent markov chains. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, 6:223 – 240, 1978.
[23] Harold J. Kushner. On the weak convergence of interpolated Markov chains to a diffusion. *Ann. Probab.*, 2:40–50, 1974.
[24] Jörg Osterrieder. *Arbitrage, Market Microstructure and the Limit Order Book*. Ph.D. thesis, ETH Zurich. DISS. ETH Nr 17121, 2007.
[25] Ioanid Roşu. A dynamic model of the limit order book. *Rev. Financ. Stud.*, 22(11):4601–4641, 2009.
[26] John B. Walsh. An introduction to stochastic partial differential equations. In *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIV—1984*, volume 1180 of *Lect. Notes Math.*, pages 265–439. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

Weierstrass Institute, Mohrenstr. 39, 10117 Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: christian.bayer@wias-berlin.de

Humboldt University Berlin, Department of Mathematics, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: horst@math.hu-berlin.de

Humboldt University Berlin, Department of Mathematics, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany
E-mail address: qiujinn@gmail.com